Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-020
Wednesday
1 February 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-020 *1 February 1989*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Karpov, Omelichev News Conference on Force Figures 1
'Rough Parity' in Europe *[TASS]* 1
Pact Allies 'Initiatives' Praised *[TASS]* 1
Far East Figures 'Soon' *[Moscow Radio]* 1
Pact, NATO Reactions to Pact Force Figures Cited *[IZVESTIYA 31 Jan]* 2
U.S. Caught 'Off Guard' by Pact Force Cuts *[Moscow TV]* 3
Production of Bacteriological Weapons Denied *[Lebedinskiy in IZVESTIYA 28 Jan]* 3
U.S. 'Competitive Strategies' Concept Analyzed *[Starodubov in PRAVDA 27 Jan]* 4

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Moscow TV To Explain Error on Nakasone Remarks 7 Feb *[Moscow International]* 6
Results of CSCE Forum in Vienna Discussed 6
Socialist Envoys Briefed *[TASS]* 6
Achievements Praised *[Drobkov in PRAVDA 30 Jan]* 6
Roundtable on Relations With U.S., Others *[Primakov, Shishlin, Levin on Moscow Radio]* 8
Soviet-U.S.-Chinese Relations Examined *[Belov on Moscow International]* 12
U.S. Vetoes Security Council Statement on Israel *[TASS]* 13
UN Human Rights Conference Begins in Geneva 30 Jan *[Matyash on TASS]* 13
Agenda Detailed *[Shishlo on TASS]* 14
Parliamentarians Meet in Moscow on Arctic Ecology 14
Envoy Zagladin Comments *[TASS]* 14
Zagladin Addresses Meeting *[TASS]* 15
Petrovskiy Urges Cooperation on Environment *[PRAVDA 31 Jan]* 15

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. Criticized for 'Falsehoods' on Afghanistan *[Kornilov on TASS]* 18
Daily Views TIME Editors' Profile of Bush *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 31 Jan]* 18
Senate Confirmation of Bush Appointees Noted *[IZVESTIYA 28 Jan]* 19
Scowcroft Remark on Continued Cold War Challenged *[Matveyev in IZVESTIYA 29 Jan]* 20
Tower's 'Lone Voice' Warns of 'Soviet Threat' *[Matveyev in IZVESTIYA 1 Feb]* 21
Yakovlev, Jesse Jackson Confer on World Relations *[TASS]* 21
Petrovskiy Receives Harvard School Director *[TASS]* 22

China

Shevardnadze Leaves for Official Visit to PRC 22
Slyunkov, Others See Him Off *[Moscow Radio]* 22
Visit Will Help Normalize Ties *[TASS]* 22
Full Potential Not Yet Tapped *[TASS]* 23
Trip Basis for Optimism *[Vasilyev in IZVESTIYA 31 Jan]* 23
Soviet Desires for Good PRC Ties Reaffirmed *[Belov on Moscow International]* 24
Article Describes PRC Foreign Policy Development *[PRAVDA 28 Jan]* 25
Bureaucratic Obstacles Swept Aside in PRC Reform *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Jan]* 27
PRC's Zhao Cited on Party Work Priorities *[PRAVDA 30 Jan]* 28
PRC Agriculture Minister Cited on Fishing Talks *[PRAVDA 28 Jan]* 29

Northeast Asia

Gerasimov Urges Improvement in Japanese Relations *[IZVESTIYA 28 Jan]* 29
Japanese Reactions to Disarmament Initiative Noted *[Gavrilov on Moscow International]* 29
Japanese Defense Buildup Against Spirit of Times *[Dmitriyev on Moscow International]* 30
Japanese Socialists Criticize Military Increase *[Moscow International]* 31

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Supreme Soviet Group's Philippines Visit Noted *[IZVESTIYA 29 Jan]* 31
Australian Minister's Manila Visit Discussed *[Moscow International]* 33
Thai-Indochinese Trade Prospects 'Promising' *[Fedorov on Moscow International]* 33

Near East & South Asia

Relations With Israel To Resume 'Within 3 Months' *[Kuwait AL-RA'Y AL-'AMM 31 Jan]* 34
General Gromov Says Afghan Withdrawal On Target *[TASS]* 34
Afghan Rebels Blow Up Kabul Shopping Center *[TASS]* 34
Writers Group Chairman Discusses Afghan Prospects *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 27 Jan]* 34
Afghan Army's Highway Assignment 'Far From Easy' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Feb]* 36
Unions Request Help for Afghan Service Veterans *[Moscow Radio]* 36
IZVESTIYA Interviews DFLP's Hawatimah *[31 Jan]* 37
Polyakov, Arab Ambassadors Discuss Mideast Peace *[Amman AL-RA'Y 1 Feb]* 38
India's Gandhi Interviewed on Regional Relations *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jan]* 39

East Europe

PRAVDA Reports Hungarian Troop Cut Decision *[1 Feb]* 39
Hungarian Political Liberalization Viewed *[PRAVDA 30 Jan]* 39
Sakharov Decries CSSR Crackdown, Soviet Support *[AFP]* 42
MPD Chief Lizichev Returns From Prague *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jan]* 43
Jaruzelski: Pluralism Must Not Imperil Stability *[PRAVDA 26 Jan]* 43
Jaruzelski on Economic Reform, Democratization *[PRAVDA 28 Jan]* 43
PRAVDA Outlines PZPR Reorganization Plans *[29 Jan]* 43
CPSU's Medvedev Visits Romania, Meets Leaders 44
Leaves Moscow, Arrives in Bucharest *[PRAVDA 31 Jan]* 44
Talks With Ceausescu, Olteanu *[TASS]* 44
Comments on Talks *[Moscow TV]* 45
Returns to Moscow *[TASS]* 45
Katushev Meets With Romania's Andrei 25 January *[IZVESTIYA 28 Jan]* 45
GDR's Ott Ends Talks with Aboymov, Rogachev *[East Berlin ADN]* 45
Zaykov Returns From SFRY, Met by Yakovlev *[TASS]* 45
SFRY Trade Unionists Arrive in Moscow *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 46
Suvar Strictures at LCY CC Plenum Cited *[PRAVDA 31 Jan]* 46

West Europe

Scientist 'Disappears' in Paris, Emigrates to Israel *[Paris AFP]* 46
Becomes Israeli Citizen *[Jerusalem Radio]* 47
Yakovlev, UK Envoy Discuss Gorbachev Visit *[TASS]* 47
Daily Interviews UK's Howe; Comments on Remarks *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 1 Feb]* . 47
Talks Held With French Industrial Delegation *[TASS]* 48
French Minister Hails Joint Ventures *[IZVESTIYA 29 Jan]* 49
CPSU Environment Experts, FRG Greens Hold Seminar *[Hamburg DPA]* 50
Spanish Stance on Near East Settlement Lauded *[PRAVDA 31 Jan]* 50
Kovalev Receives New Luxembourg Ambassador *[IZVESTIYA 28 Jan]* 51

Latin America & Caribbean

Navy Commander in Chief Arrives in Cuba for Visit *[TASS]* 51
Yakovlev Receives Cuba's Risquet for Talks 27 Jan *[PRAVDA 28 Jan]* 51

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Further on Nominations of Deputy Candidates 52
*PRAVDA Notes Process 'Lessons' *[28 Jan]* 52
Self-Management Committee Candidates *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jan]* 54
*More on Journalist, Writer Candidates *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 28 Jan]* 55
Uzbek SSR's KGB Chief Dies 'Suddenly' *[IZVESTIYA 1 Feb]* 56
Uzbek Leadership Corruption Reviewed *[Moscow International]* 56
*Resignation of Uzbek President Detailed *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 4]* 57
Estonian People's Front-TASS Case Delayed *[Tallinn Radio]* 57
Readers Cite Lithuanian Language Problems *[TIESA 15 Dec]* 57
*Disinformation About Lithuanian Movement Claimed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 22 Dec]* .. 59
'Sovereign' Lithuanian Journalists Union Set Up *[Vilnius International]* 60
Vezirov Addresses Azerbaijan Party Aktiv 13 Jan *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 15 Jan]* 61
'No Miracles' Foreseen for NKAO Committee *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 28 Jan]* 67
'Exact' Tajik Quake Death Toll, Aid Efforts Noted *[IZVESTIYA 28 Jan]* 68
Belorussian Central Committee Releases Kolokolov *[ZVYAZDA 31 Dec]* 68
Popularity of Stalin, Khrushchev, Brezhnev Polled *[TASS]* 68
Commentary on Andreyeva Interview With U.S. Daily *[Moscow TV]* 69
Displays of 'Intolerance' by Literati Criticized *[PRAVDA 28 Jan]* 70
Kazakh Writer Urges Input on Plenum on Ethnic Ties *[PRAVDA 27 Jan]* 70
Solovyev Visits Leningrad Museum Exhibit *[Moscow TV]* 71
Three Sailors Die in Icebreaker Fire *[TASS]* 72
Kuybyshev Oblast Officials Said To Harass Critics *[Moscow TV]* 72
Council of Ministers Repeals Decrees on Zhdanov *[Moscow TV]* 72
'Delicate Problem' of Inheritance Law Viewed
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 31 Jan] 72
Health Ministry Psychiatrist Interviewed *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 31 Jan]* 75

Economic

Economist Urges Budget Cuts To Reduce Deficit
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 29 Jan] 76
Economist Urges Stronger Role for Gosbank *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 26 Jan]* .. 79
Economist Urges Elimination of Food Subsidies
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 18 Jan] 80
'Precrisis' Economy Blamed on Stalinist Dogmas *[IZVESTIYA 26 Jan]* 82

Scientific

'Mir' Crew Conducts Astrophysical, Medical Tests *[TASS]* 85
Baklanov Addresses Computer Technology Meeting *[Moscow Radio]* 85
Magnetic Levitation Train Project Considered *[IZVESTIYA 29 Jan]* 85
Liquified Gas-Powered Plane Makes First Flight *[Moscow TV]* 86

Military

Yazov Views Restructuring of Military Training *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jan]* 86

Karpov, Omelichev News Conference on Force Figures

'Rough Parity' in Europe

LD3101161389 Moscow TASS in English 1542 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 31 TASS—Taking into account all the components of the military balance, one can say that the Warsaw Treaty and NATO have a rough parity in Europe and that neither enjoys decisive military superiority, Colonel-General Bronislav Omelichev, first deputy chief of the Soviet Armed Forces' General Staff, said here Tuesday.

He was speaking at a news conference devoted to the publication by the Warsaw Treaty member states of data on the balance of the armed forces and armaments of the two military political blocs in Europe. The data shows, General Omelichev said, that with roughly equal strength in ground troops and air force personnel, NATO countries have a two-to-one advantage in naval strike aviation, combat helicopters and anti-tank systems, while the Warsaw Treaty countries are superior in anti-aircraft forces, tanks, tactical missile launchers, defensive aircraft, armored personnel carriers and artillery.

The General Staff spokesman said that the data concerning NATO is based on intelligence available to the Warsaw Treaty. Asked if unilateral cuts in armed forces and armaments that have been announced by Warsaw Treaty members will give NATO a margin of superiority, he explained that "NATO will not get a decisive advantage."

Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Karpov, speaking at the same news conference, said the data published by the Warsaw treaty characterizes the overall balance of arms and armed forces between the two blocs in Europe and covers all their weapons. As far as Vienna talks next March are concerned, they will be conducted on the basis of data included in the mandate for these negotiations, which was endorsed earlier this month, he added.

Karpov described calls in the West for a continued arms buildup and modernization of all kinds of nuclear weaponry, which were made, in particular, at the 26th annual convention of the military-scientific society Wehrkunde in West Germany, as a kind of response to positive trends in Europe and elsewhere.

"Trends connected with the nascent process of real disarmament are worrying those with vested interests in a continued arms race and in continued international tensions," he said.

"One is made wary by the circumstance that the chorus of these people has been joined by future U.S. Defense Secretary John Tower.

"One's impression is that his calls for modernizing nuclear weapons are utterly at odds with the neeed to ensure continuity in Soviet-American relations.

"One would like to hope that these are just the hitches of the transitional period since the new administration is only being formed," Karpov said. Answering reporters' questions, he said that "the Soviet Union thinks highly of initiatives made by its Warsaw Treaty allies on measures to restructure their armed forces and reduce military spending and troops."

All this, in his words, is creating a new atmosphere in Europe, which is conducive to successful talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments.

Pact Allies 'Initiatives' Praised

LD3101145289 Moscow TASS in English 1531 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 31 TASS—"The Soviet Union highly assesses the initiatives made by its Warsaw Treaty allies on measures to restructure its armed forces and reduce military spending and troops," Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Karpov told a news conference here on Tuesday.

All this activity, he said, is carried out in conformity with the agreed-upon line of implementing the defensive military doctrine which was adopted at the Berlin meeting of Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee.

"We believe," Viktor Karpov said, "that these actions create in Europe a new atmosphere conducive to the success of the talks on reducing troops and armaments in Europe, on developing a new, second generation, system of confidence building measures in line with the Stockholm decisons."

Far East Figures 'Soon'

LD3101211289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 31 Jan 89

["Correspondence, Reportage, Commentaries, and Interviews" program presented by Aleksandr Zhetvin]

[Text] [Zhetvin] And now we will talk about an international news conference. Comrades, you probably read attentatively a very interesting article in PRAVDA about the Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers Committee data on the numerical strength and armaments of both the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries. This was the first time data of this kind has been published, and this article aroused enormous interest and sparked many commentaries throughout the world. A news conference of leading foreign policy and military experts on this Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers Committee statement was held today in the USSR Foreign Ministry press center.

Colonel General Omelichev, first deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, said:

[Begin Omelichev recording] In publishing the data on the balance of armed forces, armaments, and naval forces of the Warsaw Pact and NATO in Europe, our

objective was to show in a wider context the real picture of the balance of the armed forces of the two military-political blocs. It is obvious from the data cited that with a roughly equal strength in infantry and air force, the NATO countries have a 2 to 1 advantage in naval forces.

The North Atlantic alliance also has an advantage over the Warsaw Pact in strike aviation, helicopter gunships, and antitank missile systems. At the same time we are not concealing the fact that the Warsaw Pact has superiority in air defense forces, tanks, tactical missile launchers, defensive aircraft, armored personnel carriers, and artillery. On the whole, taking into account all components of the military balance, one can say that the Warsaw Pact and NATO have a rough parity in Europe, and that neither side has decisive military superiority.

The data we cited was accurate for 1 July 1988. Therefore, it does not take into account the unilateral reduction of armed forces and armaments by the USSR, announced in 1989 by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, or the unilateral reductions by its Warsaw Pact allies announced in 1990. The Warsaw Pact states are prepared to start constructive dialogue in Vienna on reducing armed forces and armaments. We consider it expedient to examine first at the talks the problems of eliminating the disparity in weapons with first-strike capability. We also feel the NATO countries could follow the USSR's example and take unilateral measures to reduce their armed forces and armaments to promote progress at the talks.

A question might arise: Why did we wait until now to publish the data on the balance of the Warsaw Pact and NATO armed forces and armaments? We were prepared to do this even in the past. As early as last March, the Warsaw Pact member states proposed that numerical data should be officially exchanged between the two military-political alliances. However, the NATO countries did not respond positively to our initiative. Last November, they unilaterally published their own data, and the Warsaw Pact member states had to repeatedly and carefully examine it to be certain that the numerical data, which was prepared for publication, was absolutely accurate. Following this examination, the data was published yesterday simultaneously in all Warsaw Pact countries.

A question is being asked, when will the data on the Soviet Armed Forces as a whole be published? It is possible to say that the first and very important step has been made on the path toward this: detailed data on the USSR's armed forces in Europe were published. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said at the meeting with the representatives of the Trilateral Commission, we will soon be able to publish the data on our defensive potential in the Far East. As you can see, the process of glasnost is gradually making it possible to publish what was previously closed and strictly guarded. [end recording]

[Zhetvin] In answering questions, the news conference participants stressed that military parity in Europe between the two blocs will not be broken despite unilateral reductions by the Warsaw Pact member states of their armed forces and armaments.

Pact, NATO Reactions to Pact Force Figures Cited

PM3101122489 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
31 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Interested Reaction: How the Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers Committee Statement Is Assessed Abroad"]

[Text] The central newspapers in the Warsaw Pact countries today published the Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers Committee statement "On the Correlation of Warsaw Pact and North Atlantic Alliance Force Strengths and Armaments in Europe and Adjoining Waters." Poland's ZYCIE WARSZAWY notes that a favorable opportunity for the publication of such a document was created by the USSR's unilateral steps to reduce its armed forces and armaments, announced by M.S. Gorbachev at the UN General Assembly session on 7 December last year.

TRYBUNA LUDU, in a commentary headed "Glasnost in Information Policy—An Expression of the Changes in International Relations," notes that this document is exceptionally significant. This is the first time that figures on force strengths and armaments have been officially made public. This reflects changes in the way of thinking and fosters hopes that the goodwill of Warsaw Pact countries is at last perceived as a desire to take a constructive step along the path of further reducing military tension and strengthening peace.

The Bulgarian newspapers publish the statement under headings like "Warsaw Pact Reports Figures on Its Armed Forces," "Making Military-Political Alliances Strictly Defensive," and "Step Toward Peace and Security in Europe." The full text of the statement is published in Czechoslovakia's newspapers. RUDE PRAVO stresses that the document is intended to help create a constructive, businesslike atmosphere at the talks soon to open in Vienna.

The full text of the statement is published by newspapers in the GDR, Hungary, and Romania.

AFP reports: The Warsaw Pact has for the first time published detailed information on its conventional forces in Europe, declaring approximate parity with NATO forces. The publication of this assessment of the military balance in Europe came after NATO had published its own figures at the end of November, testifying to the overwhelming superiority of Warsaw Pact forces. The statement expresses the Warsaw Pact's readiness to eliminate existing imbalances and make significant reductions in offensive arms.

Meanwhile, Western politicians continue to speak out on the subject of the unilateral steps announced by the USSR to reduce armed forces and armaments.

U.S. Defense Secretary J. Tower, speaking at the 26th conference of the "Wehrkunde" military science society that has just ended in Munich, called on the NATO member countries to continue to maintain a "healthy skepticism" about the disarmament steps being taken by the Soviet Union, and to reserve the West's right to choose on the question of modernizing nuclear weapons. He demanded that the modernization of Western countries' nuclear and conventional arms begin without delay.

Rowny, special adviser to the U.S. President on arms control, stated in a British television interview that NATO should adopt a wait-and-see position with regard to the Soviet promise to reduce arms unilaterally. In his opinion NATO would be making a mistake by prematurely reducing its forces in response to Gorbachev's statement last month that he intends to reduce the strength of the Soviet Armed Forces by half a million and disband [rasformirovat] six tank divisions stationed in Eastern Europe.

Canada's GAZETTE reports: Canadian National Defense Minister P. Beatty, speaking in Ottawa at the annual conference of members of defense associations, stated that Canada is prepared to step up contacts in the military sphere and cooperation with the Soviet Union. At the same time the minister stated that Canada and its NATO allies should remain vigilant militarily.

U.S. Caught 'Off Guard' by Pact Force Cuts

LD2901185789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 29 Jan 89

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Igor Kudrin]

[Text] Hello, comrades! As in the old tale of the 12 months, January has fittingly taken over the reigns of control from December, from that December when the Soviet leader put forward a whole series of peace-loving proposals from the lofty rostrum of the United Nations Organization. At the recent meeting with representatives of the Trilateral Commission, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev reiterated our firm course to reduce armed forces, arms production, and military technology. To judge from what he said, we will soon be finding out about our defense potential from our own reliable sources rather than those of the West.

Of late, Poland and Hungary have announced reductions of their military budgets and they are reducing (?them considerably) as did the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia just a few days ago. You will understand yourselves, comrades, that such decisions are not only dictated by goodwill to the world and trust, but also by a concern to improve the lives of the citizens of the socialist countries.

Some U.S. military figures have quite simply been alarmed by the peaceful initiatives of the countries of socialism, as they have been caught off guard. If the Warsaw Treaty cuts its armed forces, it means that sooner or later we shall have to follow that example. That is how they reason. This would mean having to withdraw part of the U.S. troops from Europe. The problem then arises: How would we get them back to Europe in the event of war? Look, those words again: in the event of war. How difficult it is all the same to reject old theories and doctrines.

Production of Bacteriological Weapons Denied

PM3101132589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed report followed by commentary by member of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences Lieutenant General V.A. Lebedinskiy under the general heading: "Concerning an Item in THE WASHINGTON TIMES"]

[Text] The U.S. newspaper THE WASHINGTON TIMES published on 19 January an article by Bill Hertz which contained the following claims. One: The Soviet Union is continuing or at least continued until 1987 the production of bacteriological weapons at several "secret enterprises," two of which are definitely producers of bacteriological weapons and the remainder of which could be too. Two: The Soviet Union has given some of these weapons or the technology for producing them to other countries, or has used them on the territory of other states—Laos, Cambodia, Iraq, Libya, and Afghanistan are named.

In principle, the very reputation of THE WASHINGTON TIMES, which is extremely poor in the sense of news authenticity even in the United States itself, suggests that one can ignore its claims. Particularly as the system of arguments used to reinforce the aforementioned claims does not inspire much confidence—a reference to a "secret report" allegedly prepared by intelligence organs a year ago for the National Security Council, a reference to "U.S. officials" who asked not to be named, a quote from a "State Department aide" who had also asked to remain anonymous, and a reference to "an administration aide." Indeed, the timing of the publication indicates a dual intention: on the one hand, to cause a sensation; on the other, to avoid the slightest risk of being found to have dubious "arguments" and "sources." That day, 19 January, was the very last day of the term in office of the Reagan administration, which therefore had neither the time nor the opportunity to react to the sensation and confirm or refute information allegedly emanating from "its aides." And the Bush administration is not inclined to do so, of course.

The nature of the item, we repeat, is such that in itself it would not merit attention. But, considering that it is not the first time such accusations have been made and, obviously not the last, we asked the USSR Defense Ministry to comment.

Here is what Medical Service Lieutenant General V.A. Lebedinskiy, full member of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences and a leading expert on protection from biological weapons, said:

The information published in THE WASHINGTON TIMES does not tally with the facts; it is a source of amazement. The Soviet Union has always been in favor of a ban on biological weapons, regarding them as an inadmissible means of warfare. Our country has never developed and never produced such weapons and has never possessed them, which totally rules out the transfer of any technologies to other states. It is even more astonishing to hear statements about the use of bacteriological weapons, in particular the so-called "yellow rain," on the territories of other states. U.S. scientists also know how absurd such accusations are. It is a widely known, accepted fact. A study by Matthew Mezelson, a Harvard University biochemist, and Thomas Sili [both names as transliterated], a Yale University biologist, presents convincing data to the effect that the samples of so-called mycotoxins gathered in several areas of Southeast Asia and repeatedly used by the U.S. State Department as "evidence of their combat use" by the Soviet Union, are in fact bee excreta. You would think that would be the last we would hear about "yellow rain." Not so, however.

It is clear from this story what value one can place on accusations about Soviet violations of the 1972 Bacteriological Weapons Convention, which our country is observing undeviatingly and is adopting all the measures it can to strengthen.

The question of the existence of secret facilities in the Soviet Union has been raised several times in the United States in one form or another, so THE WASHINGTON TIMES was adding nothing new to previous "sensational" claims. In reply to all of these claims I will repeat what has already been said: There is no bacteriological weapons production in our country, so there cannot be any secret facilities engaged in this production. One ought to add that back in 1987 we handed to the UN agency dealing with disarmament issues a list of laboratories and institutes in which work is being carried out with dangerous microorganisms. It also described research in progress, which has a variety of scientific and national economic obectives, except one—the development and creation of bacteriological weapons.

U.S. 'Competitive Strategies' Concept Analyzed

PM3001112989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jan 89 Second Edition p 7

[Lieutenant General Viktor Starodubov article under the "From Differing Standpoints" rubric, responding to THE WALL STREET JOURNAL article by Tim Carrington reprinted on opposite page under headline "What's New in War Games": "Old Hat in Military Policy. Accords Are the Solution to the Question"]

[Text] What are the "competitive strategies" to which senior Pentagon officials even devote complex computer "war games?"

President R. Reagan's report on U.S. strategy in the national security sphere, published 28 January 1987, said the following about them:

"These strategies aim to use our technical superiority in a thoughtful and systematic way to induce the Soviets to compete with us less effectively or less efficiently in the military application of technology. The point of these strategies is to render part of the colossal Soviet war machine outmoded and force the Soviets to redistribute their resources in a way that they do not wish...."

"Competitive strategies" is a new U.S. military-political concept, which has still not been fully developed. However, its young "author," Dennis Kloske, stated recently that the first major study on ways to introduce them in relation to the "NATO-Warsaw Pact confrontation" has already been carried out.

In the opinion of U.S. experts, the new concept should determine the priority areas and basic long-term programs for building the U.S. Armed Forces in the 1990's. But that is not all. It is intended that "competitive strategies" will become an overall NATO concept—the first ill wind of them has already appeared in Europe. It is the program for "modernizing" NATO weapons.

The concept's main idea is to make accelerated use of the United States' and the West's "considerable technological advantages" with a view to achieving surefire military superiority over the USSR and the socialist community countries.

There are three spheres where Americans calculate that "state-of-the-art technologies hold considerable advantages" for the United States:

"Stealth" technology (at present the F-117A fighter and the B-2 bomber), which renders aircraft and cruise missiles "invisible" to radars;

New discoveries in the sphere of superconductivity;

Developments within the framework of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI).

"Competitive strategies" is still being elaborated in detail. It is clear that it allocates a key role to technologies whose application can be expected not only to improve traditional types of weapons but—and this is the main thing—to create new forms of weapons and robots with "artificial intelligence." The highest priority here is given to systems distinguished by particular accuracy and difficulty of detection.

The reader will have noticed, I imagine, that the SDI program is also ranked among "competitive strategies." Yet, it is well known that SDI is geared to securing the aggressor against retaliation in the event of his using nuclear weapons first. He would not decide to carry out

a nuclear strike without the large-scale ABM defense system envisaged under this program. Consequently, SDI has its origins in aggression rather than in "containing the threat."

Other outlandish weapons that the article talks about in such inspired terms also bear no relation to defense. They are not being developed to "balance forces" at all.

Common sense (not to mention military science) suggests that the correlation of individual types of arms that have been "singled out" from the many types of arms that exist is by no means the correlation of the sides' military forces. Yes, the Warsaw Pact countries are superior to the NATO bloc in terms of the numbers of their tanks, artillery, and, possibly, armored personnel carriers. NATO representatives never stop talking about this. No one is attempting to hide it. I wonder if the article's author asked himself the following question: Why don't people in NATO mention tactical strike aircraft? Why do they avoid even mentioning naval arms? The whole point is that NATO has the edge in these arms.

Incidentally, when a new concept is discussed in terms of more than just propaganda, all branches of the armed forces are examined—ground forces, aviation, and naval forces. For instance, the U.S. defense secretary's report to Congress on the military budget for fiscal 1988-89, which assigns "competitive strategies" a crucial place, devotes more attention to Navy topics than to other branches of the armed forces. "Superiority at sea," the secretary stressed, "enables us to exploit the Soviet Union's geographical vulnerability and pose a global threat to Soviet interests."

In this connection it is interesting to compare the new concept with NATO's stance at the upcoming talks on limiting armed forces and conventional arms in Europe. NATO representatives would first like to examine and limit tanks, artillery, and armored personnel carriers at equal levels for both sides, that is, the arms in which the Warsaw Pact has the edge. Then they would ("possibly") like to examine and limit air force armaments (in order to preserve Western superiority in tactical strike aircraft, the intention is to "jumble it up" in the overall mass of all types of war planes, including air defense planes). The third component in the balance of the sides' forces—naval forces—are not to be examined at all, not even at confidence-building talks. Last, they would like to oppose any attempts to include the question of qualitative indicators for arms in the fabric of talks.

It is evidently hoped as a result of these tactics to secure substantial military advantage thanks to the greater numerical strength of their tactical strike aviation and their substantial superiority in naval arms.

But what about "competitive strategies?" They are geared toward ensuring that this superiority increases still further. According to the people who compile them, the programs already launched for qualitatively improving existing types of arms and hardware and also the programs for creating new types and models should ultimately produce overwhelming military superiority for NATO over the Warsaw Pact.

Thus, the United States and NATO are responding to the efforts of the USSR and other Warsaw Pact countries aimed at reducing the level of military confrontation and reducing the military threat by preparing a new rush toward military superiority. Naturally, they will not achieve this, but what they could do is to seriously damage the cause of disarmament and the security of the people.

Judging by the results of the fall (1988) sessions of the NATO leadership organs, not all the bloc's countries unreservedly support the "modernization" of NATO's weaponry. It follows from T. Carrington's article that there are also people in Washington who are critical of the "competitive strategy" idea. However, the idea has not been rejected, and some members of the new U.S. Administration have already spoken approvingly of it. That cannot fail to prompt caution.

Moscow TV To Explain Error on Nakasone Remarks 7 Feb
OW0102014489 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] An hour-long videotaped program called "Studio 9" was carried by Soviet television on Saturday evening, 28 January. Among those participating in this program were former U.S. Secretary of State Kissinger; former Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone; and, from the Soviet side, Falin, chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, and Primakov, member of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The program was presented by Zorin, political observer for Soviet television and radio.

Tens of millions of television viewers watched this interesting and constructive debate. The details of the "Studio 9" program have also been broadcast by Moscow radio in various languages of the world. To our regret, however, there was a mistake in this television program. Regarding this program, the KYODO news agency of Japan reported on 29 January that in Mr Nakasone's remarks on the unsettled issues between Japan and the USSR, the northern territorial issue was deleted.

Moscow Radio asked Mr Zorin of the "Studio 9" program for an explantion. According to his explanation, Mr Nakasone's remarks were by no means deleted intentionally, but it has been disclosed that a technical mistake was involved. The simultaneous translator did an excellent job; however, partly due to Mr Nakasone's rapid speech, he missed the mention of the northern territorial issue and failed to translate it. The debate itself was broadcast without any other deletion.

Moscow Television expresses regret over this mistake and will inform Soviet listeners of the mistake in the television program "Rezonans" [Repercussions] on 7 February. Meanwhile, we would like to apologize to our listeners as this date—7 February—was incorrectly given as 9 February in our program yesterday.

Results of CSCE Forum in Vienna Discussed

Socialist Envoys Briefed
LD2801101289 Moscow TASS in English 0848 GMT 28 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 28 TASS—The Political Bureau of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee has recommended the USSR's ministries and departments getting down immediately to implementing the commitments assumed in Vienna, being guided by the fact that they are binding for all participating states since the moment of their adoption. The attention of socialist countries' ambassadors, who on Friday were received by Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, first deputy foreign minister of the USSR, and Ivan Aboymov, deputy foreign minister of the USSR, was drawn to this.

The ambassadors of Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the German Democratic Republic, Kampuchea, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Romania, Czechoslovakia, representatives of the embassies of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Poland, Cuba and Mongolia attended the meeting.

Relying on the political evaluation of the Vienna review conference as the one that takes the Helsinki CSCE process to the new level, as an unprecedented event both for Europe and the entire world, which was given by Mikhail Gorbachev, the USSR's principled approach and practical steps to implement the Vienna accords in all directions were set out to the ambassadors. [sentence as received]

They were informed about the USSR's steps toward attaining a comprehensive political settlement of the Afghan problem, the appraisal of the obtaining situation. It was noted that the Soviet Union, remaining to be loyal to its obligations under the Geneva agreements, intends to continue lending all-round support and assistance to the Afghan leadership in its efforts to bring peace to Afghanistan.

The ambassadors were told about the humane aid being given to the population of Kabul and other cities, which is threatened with economic blockade by opposition Afghan groups. They were also informed about the priority plans of Soviet assistance to the Afghan people, including the United Nation's line.

Achievements Praised
PM3101105389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jan 89 Second Edition p 7

[Vladimir Drobkov "View from Moscow": "Vienna Accord"]

[Text] In international life there are events whose significance and relevance do not diminish with the passage of time but which, on the contrary, assume their full importance. Such an event, in my view, was the January meeting in Vienna of states which had taken part in the Helsinki all-European conference.

After 27 months of intensive talks, searches, debates, mistakes, and compromises the participants in the Vienna meeting adopted a final document on January 15 which included accords on progress in all areas of the Helsinki Final Act. The successful completion of the Vienna meeting was characterized almost unanimously as an outstanding breakthrough in the search for joint solutions to the problems facing Europe and the world; as an outstanding example of cooperation among the 33 European states, as well as Canada and the United States; and as a new landmark in world development.

All these high evaluations are entirely merited and objective. Vienna really did succeed not only in achieving mutual understanding on the most important political, economic, military, and humanitarian aspects of the situation in Europe, but also in outlining a precise agenda for the further advancement of the Helsinki process in the next few years. As an appendix to the final document a mandate was elaborated for talks on conventional armed forces and armaments in Europe, which will enable the 23 Warsaw Pact and NATO countries to begin work soon on the establishment of stability and security in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals at the lowest possible level of armed forces and conventional arms. The final document also opens the way to parallel talks among all 35 countries on confidence-building measures in the military sphere. Vienna agreed on a whole series of steps in developing the human dimension of the Helsinki process, including the holding of three conferences on this problem—in Paris, Copenhagen, and Moscow. The development of the member countries' economic, scientific, technical, and environmental cooperation has been outlined.

Consequently a significant new step has been taken toward the establishment on our planet of that period of peace of which M.S. Gorbachev spoke from the UN rostrum in December. Another hurdle has been overcome on the way to implementing the program for creating a world free of nuclear weapons and violence in which mankind's survival and progress on the principles of common sense, a balance of interests, and the priority of general human values would be guaranteed.

Was it easy to take that step and overcome that hurdle? Of course not. The very length of the Vienna meeting—more than 2 years—shows that the diplomats from 35 countries had a lot of work to do in the search for mutually acceptable solutions. However, the duration of the talks cannot be the main criterion in evaluating them. Just think of the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe, which lasted 15 years. These were talks which did not even lead to a joint accord. It was not the duration of the present Vienna meeting but its intensity, the purposefulness of its search for reasonable compromise, and the increased readiness of the European countries, the United States, and Canada to open the way to further progress in the all-European process which were the foundation of success.

But no matter how good the foundation, without the painstaking, conscientious, and—most important—coordinated work of the architects and builders, a lasting structure cannot be built. And what happens when there are "teams" from 35 different states taking part in the building, with each team concerned, quite naturally, that its own national interests should be observed first of all? The "experience" of building the Tower of Babel springs to mind here. Vienna managed to avoid a repetition of that. A common language was found, even if not immediately. It was the language of political realism, readiness for compromise, and respect for the other side's positions and views.

It has to be admitted that at first neither we nor the other participants in the meeting in the Austrian capital fully mastered that language—a language so necessary for normal and constructive international communication. Replying to questions from PRAVDA's editorial office on the significance of the Vienna meeting's results, M.S. Gorbachev said that "at the talks there were numerous situations when emotions could have erupted and wrecked everything. But we were always held in check by the realization that peace is not a gift from above and that no one is going to hand it to us. Therefore, it is necessary to work stubbornly, persistently, and patiently in the search for solutions and an agreement which pleases everyone. In urging others to reach rational compromises, we ourselves in those years covered a considerable distance in our understanding and evaluation of certain problems which were sometimes the object of keen skirmishes in Vienna."

Those words, it seems to me, were a concentrated expression of that selfsame new political thinking which is also the sole key and means of opening the door to the solution of the complex and closely interwoven and interlinked global problems of the present day. Do not yield to emotions. Do not pin your hopes on the automatic "victory of the forces of peace and progress," but work scrupulously and selflessly to ensure it. While waiting for other people to make concessions do not stint on your own. Be ready to reassess familiar and even rigid dogmas and values. And most important of all—be aware of the intolerability and suicidal danger of continuing the course toward confrontation and superarmament and the reinforcement of the division of the world into opposing groupings afraid of each other.

In the nuclear age, when the accumulated means and instruments of mass destruction are sufficient to destroy civilization many times over and when the human environment has reached the crisis point, there is not and cannot be for us all any other path than the pooling of the reason, efforts, and resources of all mankind so as to guarantee its survival. This idea would seem so reasonable and obvious as to gain acceptance of its own accord. It would be brought into action by the concrete deeds of East and West, North and South. However, the practice of international relations shows otherwise. It shows that the progress of the new political thinking is far from easy everywhere, that it still has influential opponents whose direct interests are firmly linked to the preservation of suspicion and military rivalry in the world.

What is to be done with them, these opponents? Slam the door on them? Break off the talks with those who are not yet ready to agree with us? Unfortunately, we have

experienced that kind of initially effective and ideologically successful, but in fact counterproductive, "rapid response." Recall, for example, November 1983, when we ostentatiously walked out of the Geneva talks on nuclear arms limitation in Europe with the Americans. I was PRAVDA correspondent in Brussels at that time and saw how our departure delighted those same notorious "NATO hawks." Without wishing to, we gave them a pretext and justification for stepping up the program for deploying Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Western Europe. The emotions which erupted then exacted a high cost politically, militarily, and financially.

Consequently, there is only one way left—to work with our present-day opponents or adversaries in the search for mutually acceptable solutions to the most complex problems by making persistent, patient, determined, and skillful use of the entire diplomatic arsenal.

As for the preconditions of success in Vienna, that undoubtedly was ensured to a considerable extent by the 7 December UN announcement about starting a Soviet reduction of 500,000 officers and men and many thousands of tanks, the withdrawal from Europe of several of our divisions, and changes in the defensive deployment of the Soviet Armed Forces. Our country's reduction of its military spending, the decision to begin destroying the Soviet stocks of chemical weapons even before the conclusion of the corresponding international convention, and finally the promise to withdraw from central Europe the organic [shtatnyy] tactical nuclear systems of those units which are returning to the USSR also had an effect. These are all rungs on a ladder capable of leading to a real reduction of armed forces and armaments. So let us be first to climb that ladder, followed by some other members of the Warsaw Pact. Someone always has to be first and show the right way. I am confident that sooner or later the NATO countries will join us in climbing this ladder. The hurdle which we overcame together in Vienna gives considerable hope of that.

Roundtable on Relations With U.S., Others

LD2901185289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 29 Jan 89

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, director of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations; political observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin; and All-Union Radio commentator Viktor Nikolayevich Levin]

[Text] [Levin] Hello there, esteemed comrades. When Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was in New York last December, he together with President Reagan and Vice President Bush—already President-elect—met with journalists on Governor's Island. Somebody asked Reagan what he thought of Mr Gorbachev's speech at the UN General Assembly session, to which he replied that he rated the speech highly. Bush said that he supported what the President said, and then after a brief pause he added: Get in touch with me on 21 January. Well, the 21st of January has passed; George Bush has taken up his presidential duties—assuming the full rights and powers of President of the United States—and is now beginning to show his cards, so to speak. He is starting to act as head of the new administration without looking over his shoulder at his predecessor. Naturally he is taking past experience into account, but at the same time, of course, he is going to act in his own way.

In this respect one is naturally interested in his first working day and the fact that during it he phoned Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. The two of them had a conversation: Bush expressed his gratitude for a warm welcome given to his son and grandson, who visited Armenia after the tragic earthquake, and spoke of his hopes for the development of Soviet-U.S. relations. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev voiced the same hopes. But for us, of course, the big question is how those relations are going to develop and what can be expected in the near future.

[Shishlin] You know, Viktor Nikolayevich, I think that the telegram sent from Moscow to the new U.S. President and the telephone conversation you have just mentioned were not merely a matter of political etiquette, but a sure sign of the political distance covered in the development of Soviet-U.S. relations during the Reagan Administration. Furthermore, it is a kind of prologue to the Soviet-U.S. dialogue which will undoubtedly get going over the next few years.

[Primakov, interrupting] Continue, you mean.

[Shishlin] Yes, continue—that's right. For the moment, it ought to be mentioned right away that there is an inevitable technical pause every time a new U.S. Administration takes over. This technical pause is not political in nature, because I think we have sufficient reasons to believe that there will be policy continuity between the present and previous administrations.

[Primakov] Absolutely, I agree with you on that. Bush is bound to inherit much of what the previous administration did, not only by virtue of the fact that he is a Republican and not only because he was U.S. vice president in the previous administration, but because he can see that it is all working, that it is bringing colossal dividends. Dividends not only as regards stabilizing the international situation—though I would draw attention to this most of all, since it is something of which not only we, but the United States as well, are in need. Indeed, others too, all countries in the world are in need of an overall stabilization of the international, situation. Bush has sensed—and he could not fail to sense—that public opinion is totally in favor of normalizing Soviet-U.S. relations....

[Shishlin, interrupting] Incidentally, Yevgeniy Maksimovich, I have been looking at the press reports and the recent Politburo decision assessing the meeting between

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorabchev and representatives of what is known as the Trilateral Commission, a meeting in which you actually took part. Now, I get the impression that....

[Primakov, interrupting] I was present at it.

[Shishlin] Yes, you were present at it, to be more precise. Anyway, I get the impression that the discussion represented a sort of new level of understanding of, well, the essence of the situation.

[Primakov] Yes, of course. You know, we have changed our attitude toward that Trilateral Commission. We have become far more realistic and far more constructive, if I can put it that way. At one time we used to regard the commission as virtually a capitalist headquarters being set up in an attempt to achieve the impossible task of leading the whole capitalist world, and so on. We used to stick any number of labels on it and even went as far as claiming that they were attempting to form a worldwide anticommunist and anti-Soviet front. Anyway, I don't want to talk about all aspects of the commission's activities and the objective consequence of those activities—it is possible that there were some negative elements which would certainly have put us on our guard. After all, the cold war was on, it was in full swing, it reached its climax at the turn...or during the first half of the 1980's, and the battle lines of that cold war inevitably bisected the activities of the Trilateral Commission.

Now, however, the situation is completely different. The commission is headed by very prominent statesmen with a colossal amount of experience who are now trying—and I saw this first hand during Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's talk with the commission members—to find positive and constructive elements to promote East-West rapprochement under the new conditions.

[Levin] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, the press has written extensively about Mikhail Sergeyevich's meeting with the commission members and his very interesting speech setting out in detail our unilateral disarmament moves, but I don't want to pass up the opportunity of asking you what you personally were most impressed with at the meeting and what you found the most interesting.

[Shishlin] Viktor Nikolayevich, you have asked a very interesting question, but I don't think we should mislead our listeners by talking about Soviet unilateral disarmament. If there is one thing we are not doing it is unilateral disarmament. Unilateral reduction in armed forces, yes; but disarmament can only be a mutual process.

[Primakov] Yes. Well, to get back to the question you put to me, I would say that I was most impressed by the unanimity with which they now regard our policies and assess our leader. What's more, we are talking about prominent figures: Giscard d'Estaing, who was France's leader for many years, and not only the country's leader, but even the father of the French economic miracle, as he used to be called. Well, there may not have been any great miracle, but at any rate in his capacity as finance minister he was in charge of economic affairs....

[Shishlin, interrupting] While De Gaulle was still in power.

[Primakov] While De Gaulle was still in power. And then, as we remember, he went on to become an important political figure as well. There was also Henry Kissinger, a man who staked out a part of U.S. history for himself, of course, by serving for a number of years both as Secretary of State and as national security adviser to the U.S. President. He was involved in all the complex, so to speak, international affairs. And to such an extent that it was through him that the situation after the dirty Vietnam war—once they had been forced to get out—was normalized, with Kissinger trying to obtain some kind of political compensation. As for the Middle East war of 1973, it was Kissinger again who was very directly involved not only, I might say, in the events that led to the war, but in the search for a solution as well.

There was also—they really are very prominent people—there was Nakasone, one of the brightest politicians in the firmament of Japanese politics throughout the entire postwar period, I would say. And then there was David Rockefeller, who is famous not only by virtue of his personal wealth and the fact that for many a long year he headed the Chase Manhattan Bank—one of the biggest and most active banks in the world—but because he has always been actively involved in political life.

All these people were unanimous in the view that the Soviet leader is the world's number one leader. This was not just a sort of, well, you know, gesture of respect to the host—even though people here have suggested in private conversations that it was. It reflects their attitude toward the restructuring taking place in our country.

[Shishlin] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, I would like to mention something that I find very interesting, although to be honest, we did not set out today just to heap compliments on our politicians, including Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Not long ago in the United States, the well-known Gallup Institute, which conducts public opinion polls, asked inhabitants of each state who was more popular—the state's senator or Gorbachev. It is interesting that it was only in the southern states that the senators proved to be more popular than the Soviet leader. In all the other states of the United States the poll findings put Mikhail Sergeyevich on top.

[Primakov] Yes, I would like our listeners to understand us correctly. It is that in this program we are trying, that we are repeating what we used to do. It is not at all a case of this. The fact of the matter is that now, as never before, the figure of Gorbachev, the figure of the Soviet leader, personifies our policy, and one's attitude to him is one's attitude to our policy, both foreign and domestic.

And from this point of view, it was a great pleasure for me to hear everything that these major world leaders had to say. And the conversation was very constructive. Our press published almost in full Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's answers to the questions which he was asked, and his introductory remarks. And anyone reading through it again can sense this: What was involved was the fact that we are not retreating from any of our positions and that we are not fitting in with anyone. We are pursuing our course, but pursuing it on an ethical basis, on a civiliized basis and on the basis of the most realistic consideration of the reality surrounding us. But at the same time, there is no adapting-to, and there are no retreats whatsoever. I would like to stress that this is very important.

[Shishlin] Yes, and continuing this thought, I would like to say that in 1989, when we can already virtually see the curtain about to rise on the fourth year of restructuring, we can say that the restructuring taking place in the Soviet Union has been accepted in the world and great hopes are being pinned on restructuring in the Soviet Union, not only on the new image of the Soviet Union, the socialist image, the democratic image of the Soviet Union, but great hopes are also being pinned on the kind of restructuring of international relations that would make international relations truly civilized, when values common to all humanity will in practice be regarded as of paramount importance in relations between states.

This removal of ideology from relations between states, just as with any formula, probably does not reveal everything, but it may express the essence of the matter most accurately. Today, the world community has too many concerns, too many common anxieties to allow itself to be guided by some narrowly interpreted national and selfish interests. And in this respect, I think that the very idea of an internationalization of dialogue—that is, of a policy which keeps in view relations between Moscow and Washington, Moscow and Western Europe, Moscow and Eastern Europe, Moscow and Asia, and so on—this policy also proceeds along other lines, not always with the participation of Moscow, but very often with the participation of Moscow. This course toward broadening international dialogue is, of course, very promising.

[Primakov] You know, on the whole, I would even go farther. It seems to me that our restructuring has changed the world; and in this respect—of course, this is natural at present—I think that internationally we have achieved even more than within the country.

[Shishlin] That is so.

[Primakov] If one is to sepak about our achievements within the country, they are indeed great. We might wish that they would progress quicker, more decisively, so to speak and so on, but here we have enormous, truly enormous, weights which we have inherited on our feet. We also have many contradictions which are surfacing in the economic sphere now, and which are dictated, so to speak, by the new aspects, new movements, and so on. And this is where the economy yields advances, will mainly start to pay off in the next several years. But if we speak about international affairs, then there is a colossal yield already. And it is unclear which is more important, because ultimately, we came so close to crossing the line which would have threatened humanity as a whole with destruction, that I think that giving priority to international affairs, if only for now, is something which cannot be disputed. That is my view.

[Shishlin] Here I will argue a little, Yevgeniy Maksimovich. Of course, I realize the full significance of protecting the world. I agree with you that we have indeed backed away from the edge of the precipice at which we found ourselves and are beginning to move away from the edge of that precipice, and that international relations have improved, but of course, from the point of view of the interests of our people, priority is always given to our domestic affairs.

Although we are talking of international affairs, I would like to say that yes, no doubt the results of restructuring are perhaps less than expected, but after all, certain profound processes are taking place which are precisely heralding ways out, breakthroughs in areas relating to meeting the urgent needs of the people. After all, one must clearly see that the economic reform which is being carried out in our country has not yet unfolded, it has not yet gathered strength. This economic reform will inevitably be amended. And the old administrative and command-based system still functions, which is where the peculiarity of the moment lies, and this is one of the reasons for the difficulties and problems that we are encountering in the consumer goods market, that are felt by every ordinary Soviet person.

[Primakov] I would like you to understand me correctly, Nikolay Vladimirovich. I also wholly insist that the shelves in the shops should be full, and I believe that this is the most important task which has to be solved now. But I simply wanted to stress, and I want to stress again, that it is no less important to achieve a situation which would ensure that the whole of humanity is not annihilated, and us along with the whole of humanity. But, returning to the point with which we began, I would like to say that all the things we have spoken about demonstrate changes internationally, and these international changes are influencing Bush through public opinion and through other channels. This will reinforce Bush in positions of continuity with those positive aspects of Reagan's policy which he can inherit in relations with us. But at the same time, comrades, it seems to me that we should also realize that in his policy, Bush will not be a copy of Reagan. And there are not only many subjective aspects, not only the specific psychological features of each leader, which undoubtedly have their effect, but here too there are objective reasons.

One of the objective reasons is the following: There is a very large government budget deficit in the United States. I am starting with the economy, all right? And this deficit prevents Bush from carrying out a whole series of measures which he promised during the election campaign—for example, environmental and social measures, and so on—because with such a deficit it is essential that the government revenues be increased. How are such revenues to be increased? He will increase them by increasing taxes, so to speak. As you know, Reagan went in the other direction, reducing taxes in order to expand business activity, as he put it; and he succeeded in doing something here: for a lengthy period there have been no drastic slumps in the U.S. economy, although there are certain complications. But Bush will either have to do this, or to reduce expenditures. And one way they can reduce expenditure is to cut spending on preparations for war. Some things have already been started in this respect in the United States.

I think that this aspect will put pressure on Bush; and on the one hand, this will call his attention to the domestic economic situation to a greater degree than Reagan, who lately was so very bound up with the thought that historically he was joining the greatest presidents of the United States precisely by taking the path of foreign successes. Bush will be more involved in the domestic economy, and I think this will distract him somewhat from foreign affairs. He will want to normalize conditions somewhat now.

Then there is another aspect. You see, in 4 years Bush will have to defend his Presidency for another 4 years and by that time the Democrats will have regrouped. I do not think the Democrats will make do with what they have achieved. Clearly, the Democrats will advance. For instance, Senator Bradley, who has shown his worth and who is known to many of our viewers, keeps popping up. He appeared on television here and has visited the Soviet Union, and took part in the capital-to-capital television link-up between the Supreme Soviet and U.S. Congress. He is a former basketball player, a powerful, very active, and very far from stupid figure, who has a definite following, including young people; and it seems to me that Bush will have to pay more attention to public opinion. On the one hand this is a good thing, because this will force him to more constructive conduct with us—and this I have already mentioned. But on the other hand, he will have to show a little that he wants to do all this from a position of strength, so to speak, making use of those stereotypes which existed previously.

[Levin] Now here I would like to return to a certain interview with General Scowcroft, assistant to the President, now Bush's advisor on national security affairs. He said the following: The cold war has not ended, in my view. It is possible, as they say, that a light has appeared at the end of the tunnel, but I believe that it partly depends on our behavior what kind of light this is, light from the rising sun or from an approaching locomotive. I must tell you—and you probably know this yourselves—that among some of our journalist colleagues, the very mention that the cold war has not yet ended has caused some irritation. I am not inclined to dramatize this claim, for this may mean that, as they would have it, Bush is going to make his contribution in ending the cold war. And a certain downpayment is opening up for the President. But nevertheless, it might be wrong to describe this claim as fortuitous, taking into account that the Administration is just embarking on its duties. So, what can be behind this?

[Shishlin] But, Viktor Nikolayevich, the problem here is multifaceted. And when some of our colleagues receive with a certain reticence all these reservations of Bush, Scowcroft, Baker and other U.S. statesmen of the new generation, I think that this reticent reaction in itself is not justified. After all, the USSR is also under no illusion that the Soviet-U.S. dialogue will rapidly build up momentum, and that all problems—whether concerning strategic offensive weapons, strengthening of the ABM Treaty, or concerning cutbacks in conventional weapons—will be solved automatically. No! These are all very complex, difficult, and sore problems. Indeed, what is required here is to measure your cloth seven times before you cut it.

But in addition to the attention that we are paying to the Bush administration in our conversation today, I would like to draw your attention to another topic. U.S. policy will, of course, be shaped in the White House, and of course, by the present staff of the administration. But it will also be shaped by the U.S. Congress. And it is quite justified for Yevgeniy Maksimovich to have mentioned Senator Bradley, for in the U.S. Congress there is a Democratic majority which does not by any means rubber stamp the decisions adopted by the executive branch. You know, for example, that when he left, Reagan submitted a draft military budget for the upcoming year, which is still a long way away. What is more, he has determined it to be $315 billion. One can say with 100 percent certainty that unless some extraordinary incidents take place in the development of international relations, Congress will not allocate $315 billion—it will not allocate it. For, the real U.S. economic situation is such that it must seek resources to reduce the national deficit. The item that out the most here is military spending. Public spending programs in the United States cannot be cut because they have already been cut, anyway.

[Primakov] Very drastically!

[Shishlin] And it is also risky to cut some other programs. Outwardly the U.S. economy looks very balanced; the facts are that indeed 19 million jobs have been created during the years of the Reagan administration, and that inflation has been practically reduced to some absolutely insignificant percentage. But at the same time, at a deeply latent level, both the government budget deficit and the state of U.S. relations with Western

Europe and Japan will all influence U.S. policy and will contribute to the shaping of U.S. policy, while the Soviet Union takes an active stance, while the active foreign policy we implement is maintained, and while we continue to conduct the active home policy which is creating completely new notions about the USSR, which creates a new image of the USSR, which not only makes one take interest in the USSR but trust it more and more as well.

[Levin] I would add that this applies to other socialist countries too, considering the recent actions of a number of socialist countries. We began this; the USSR began it. I have in mind unilateral reduction in arms and the armed forces. Then Hungary, Poland, the GDR, and the CSSR joined in. This too has a very powerful psychological effect. True, in the West one can hear very often the view that the USSR and other socialist countries allegedly want to use their actions to complicate NATO's problems, and to hamper plans which are being hatched in the North Atlantic bloc for modernising tactical nuclear arms.

I do not doubt at all that indeed the actions of the USSR in reducing arms and the armed forces, just as the actions of other socialist countries in this direction, confuse the NATO members. But our aim is still not so much to confuse them as to consolidate peace, to confirm the sincerity of our aspiration to ensure comprehensive security at a lower level. This is the aim of our actions. Yes, of course, there are perhaps some tactical factors here as well, but as to the strategy, and the strategy is expressed....[changes thought] You know, this is surely still quite an unprecedented fact. You will agree. There is a positive reaction worldwide to the initiative of the USSR from our main partners in the talks, who so recently we called our rivals. Now the latest....

[Primakov interrupts] It is now that we call them our rivals, whereas recently we called them our opponents.

[Levin, laughing] Okay! Here is the latest fact. The GDR's initiative is that it will reduce the strength of the National People's Army by 10 percent and the military budget by 10 percent. Six tank regiments are being disbanded. The FRG Government spokesman describes this as remarkable; the U.S. Government spokesman describes this as remarkable; the British Government spokesman describes this as remarkable. This, I think, means primarily they understand that there is no other way to view this, otherwise the public would not understand. I think that at least some Western governments have their own reservations, their own doubts, and their own fears which result precisely from the fact that they are being hampered, as it were, in their modernization plans. But the facts show so plainly that these are real changes in the foreign policy of the socialist countries, real openness, and a really constructive attitude. And this yields the dividends about which we rightfully talk.

[Primakov] It seems to me that our main conclusion and our main line of thought is that in the future the situation will be complex. There will not be any straightforward moves which can be forecast with absolute clarity, even now. The general movement, the general development of this situation is undoubtedly going in a good direction, as we all think. Obviously none of us will argue with this. But the movement itself will be very complex. Zigzags, detours and so on will be possible. And it is natural to think that a considerable period of time will be needed before the elements of confrontation leave our relations with the West. They pursue and protect their own interests. This is natural. And we should consider where these interests coincide. Where they do not coincide, we should not let things go as far as confrontation, or hard confrontation. This is on what our policy is based.

[Levin] One cannot fail to agree with this opinion, I think. And since we have run out of time, thank you, esteemed comrades, for your attention. All the best.

Soviet-U.S.-Chinese Relations Examined

OW0102074289 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 25 Jan 89

[Belov commentary "No One Suffers Losses; Everyone Benefits"]

[Text] Dear listeners, a few days ago political power was ceremoniously and peacefully handed over in Washington from President Reagan's Republican administration to President Bush's Republican cabinet. Observers in the U.S. capital unanimously pointed out that, at this crucial time, both the new and outgoing Presidents expressed a constructive attitude toward Soviet-U.S. relations and further relaxing international tensions. Belov, an observer of this station, has the following comments on this:

I think listeners in the Asia-Pacific region not only [words indistinct], but also are really concerned about the future of Soviet-U.S. relations. [Words indistinct], Sino-U.S. relations, [words indistinct], and relations between major powers have an impact on international relations and the situation in the Asia-Pacific region. Whenever Soviet-U.S. relations are at a low ebb, nations over the world become apprehensive, and military allies of opposite sides step up their activities, launching successive arms races. [Words indistinct] is a very dangerous thing to the world. The situation was just like that. However, history in the past 3 years has shown the world that development in the opposite direction is also possible. Such development has not only benefited the Soviet Union and the United States. Dear listeners, let us analyze how Asia has benefited from the expanded contact between the Soviet Union and the United States, and the increased mutual trust between the two countries; and how Asia will benefit from this development in the near future.

We should consider signing the Soviet-U.S. agreement on intermediate-range missiles the most important achievement between the two countries. Initially, the agreement was aimed at Europe only. Later, as proposed by the Soviet Union, the agreement was expanded to cover Asia. Considering the wishes of Asian countries, the Soviet Union has also unilaterally destroyed its intermediate- and shorter-range missiles deployed in its territories in Asia. From the welcome alone to the agreement expressed by China, Vietnam, Japan, Australia, India, and Indonesia, we can see the impact of the Soviet-U.S. agreement on the Asia-Pacific region.

As everyone knows, the Soviet Union and the United States are continuing their dialogue on various security issues. More or less you can see that a new agreement on nuclear disarmament of a larger scale [words indistinct]. This agreement will call for the reduction of 50 percent of strategic weapons of the Soviet Union and the United States. We think, and the Americans also think that, after the agreement is signed, other nuclear powers, including China, will take part in the nuclear disarmament process. Incidentally, I wish to point out that China's widely known stand on nuclear disarmament just (?fits) this wish. So, the new agreement, and its far-reaching impact, will help open up a way to completely destroy nuclear weapons. However, this is (?considered) a long-range goal, but positive development in the Soviet-U.S. dialogue has already brought us good results. Only under the condition that Soviet-U.S. relations are relaxed can the Soviet Union possibly take an important unilateral step to cut its troops by 500,000 people, 200,000 of which will be from its troops deployed in the eastern region of the Soviet Union. We will soon begin withdrawing troops from Mongolia for the second time. Our troops in (?Mongolia) will be reduced by 75 percent. At the same time, an Air Force group currently stationed in Mongolia will be dismissed. Imagine how much the situation on the Soviet-Chinese border and the Mongolian-Chinese borders will suddenly improve. I think this will have an immediate effect on Soviet-Chinese relations. Everyone can see that, to a great extent, all this is the result of the constructive dialogue conducted between Moscow and Washington by Soviet leaders on the stand of new political thinking. Therefore, the most important thing right now is that this dialogue is continued, and that President Bush does not deviate from the pragmatic stand adopted by his predecessor during the past 3 and ½ years. We are now facing a good situation in which the new political thinking is manifested by (?constructive) acts. Soviet-U.S.-Chinese relations will very soon enter a stable and fast-developing period, which is beneficial to every party and the whole world. Here I think that one of the major developments in this direction is a Soviet-Chinese summit meeting. The Soviet Union and China are making all-out efforts to prepare for such a summit meeting.

U.S. Vetoes Security Council Statement on Israel

LD0102071689 Moscow TASS in English 0710 GMT 1 Feb 89

[Text] New York February 1 TASS—The United States has blocked a U.N. Security Council statement denouncing the escalation of Israeli repressions and violence on the occupied Palestinian territories. Journalists have been told by participants in the January 31 Security Council consultations that the American delegation alone prevented the adoption of the document supported by the other 14 Security Council members.

Talking to journalists after the consultations, U.S. Ambassador at the United Nations Vernon Walters, in a bid to justify such a stand said that the draft statement, in Washington's view, was insufficiently balanced.

U.N. Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar stressed in this connection that the U.N. stand remains unchanged—Israel should observe all Geneva convention provisions on the occupied territories. Palestine's alternate permanent observer at the United Nations, Nasir al-Qudwah, drew journalists' attention to a sharp deterioration of the situation in the occupied Palestinian territories following an increase in Israeli repression.

UN Human Rights Conference Begins in Geneva 30 Jan

LD2901220489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1015 GMT 29 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow, 29 Jan (TASS)—TASS political observer Vladimir Matyash writes:

On 30 January in Geneva, the annual session of the UN Human Rights Commission opens. The articles of international law worked out by the world community which protect the rights and freedoms of citizens in their totality are the standard whereby each state measures its degree of civilization.

The Soviet Union is coauthor of the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and is party to the international pact on civil and political rights and the international pact on economic, social, and cultural rights, as well as a whole series of fundamental international agreements in this sphere. Of course, one cannot be reconciled to the theme of human rights being exploited at times by certain circles for purposes of stirring up enmity in state-to-state relations and in the international atmosphere, or for sabotage of the processes of disarmament and detente. Therefore, the sole possible principle in the humanitarian sphere is not to meddle in the internal affairs of each other, and to build relations between states accounting for the right of each of to choose their own road.

It is not accidental that the final document approved in mid-January in Vienna by the states participating in the Helsinki process about holding humanitarian conferences in Paris, Copenhagen, and Moscow bears exceptional significance. That important decision testifies to the gradual fading away of the "cold war" stereotypes, to a transition from confrontation to mutual understanding and mutual action even on such delicate questions which

seemingly will never bring representatives of East and West to the same table. In the opinion of the USSR, this is just as much an objective necessity as universal and full nuclear disarmament.

In the area of humanitarian cooperation, the Soviet Union has advanced a whole series of concrete proposals. Thus, the USSR has advocated that national and administrative rules in the humanitarian sphere be universally brought into accordance with international obligations. At the same time, it is proposed that there be a transition to agreement on a whole series of practical steps, for example, elaboration of a world information program under the UN aegis for familiarizing people with each other's lives. Such a project should envision freeing the flow of information from partiality and prejudices, premeditated distortion of the truth, and the stereotypes of the "enemy image."

The point is, there should be cooperation in spreading ideas of peace and disarmament, and matters pertaining to the eradication of genocide, apartheid, and the profession of fascism or any other racist, nationalist, or religious exclusiveness. This also includes questions of broadening—while respecting the laws of each country—international cooperation in implementing the political, social, and private rights of people. All opportunities exist for this: There are international legal documents in the sphere of human rights; there is an experience of quests, mutual understanding, and collaboration, and most importantly there is a pressing need to arrange the life of humankind in conditions of peace and security.

Agenda Detailed

LD3001173489 Moscow TASS in English 1611 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] Geneva January 30 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vladislav Shishlo:

The U.N. Commission on Human Rights opened its 45th session in the Geneva Palace of Nations on Monday [30 January]. Participants include 1,200 delegations from 120 countries and representatives of 120 nongovernmental organizations.

The commission is comprised of 43 nations. The other countries are represented by non-voting observers.

The session will discuss pressing problems concerning the fulfillment of international covenants on human rights and prospects for drawing up further documents in this field.

In addition, the agenda includes human rights violations in Chile, Iran, Guatemala and a number of other countries as well as the adverse impact of political, military, economic and other aid to colonial and racist regimes in southern Africa on the human rights situation in the countries ruled by them.

The rights of members of national, ethnic, religious and language minorities, and other topics will be discussed as well.

Human rights abuses in Israeli-occupied lands, including Palestine, are expected to be high on the list. The U.N. Security Council's decisions condemning Israeli authorities' repressive measures against people in occupied territories form an important basis for discussions and resolutions on the issue.

Speaking on the eve of the session, Jan Martensson, director-general of the U.N. office in Geneva, said the present human rights situation in the world was no special cause for joy. He explained that much remained to be done in that field even though 40 years had passed since the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The U.N. Human Rights Commission, Martensson went on, should take advantage of the favorable situation for the United Nations and the world as a result of improved relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, progress in settling a number of regional conflicts, and the successful conclusion of the Vienna followup meeting to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The session will continue until March 10.

Parliamentarians Meet in Moscow on Arctic Ecology

Envoy Zagladin Comments

LD3001192889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0948 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow 30 Jan (TASS)—The first meeting of MP's from the countries of northern Europe and Canada on matters of ecology is to be held here on 31 January and 1 February. Taking part in it will be delegations from Denmark, Canada, Iceland, Norway, Finland, and Sweden. Representatives from the embassies of those countries with a clear interest in the problems up for discussion—the United States, Great Britain, the GDR, Poland, and the FRG—have been invited.

Vadim Zagladin, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Council of the Union's Foreign Affairs Commission and leader of the Soviet delegation to the meeting, has written a commentary especially for the TASS International Service:

"The Moscow forum has a history of its own. I recall that, speaking in Murmansk on 1 October 1987, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev put forward a number of proposals which, when taken together, form a comprehensive program of cooperation between the countries of the north—a program which is organically bound to the Soviet global initiatives and to our proposals concerning the creation of a universal system of international security.

"The specific goals for which we are striving, and at which the Murmansk program aims, include a radical reduction in the level of military confrontation in the northern region of the planet, the development there of extensive peaceful cooperation—cooperation in developing the area's natural wealth, studying it scientifically, protecting the environment, and in humanitarian contacts between peoples and nations.

"Protection of the environment occupies a special place in this list, for the present situation and the ecological state of the north give rise to very grave misgivings. Pollution of the atmosphere and the water, and the damage caused by human activity to the plant and animal world are approaching the danger level. And yet, nature is very vulnerable in the Arctic. It is particularly easy to upset the balance of the ecological systems there, and exceptionally difficult to rectify it.

"Of course, the damage to nature in the Arctic is not confined to the consequences of human activity just within its boundaries. Airstreams and sea currents carry harmful substances there, the result of industrial activity in other parts of Europe and in America, too. However, the countries of the north themselves unfortunately make a sizeable "contribution" to the destruction of the natural environment. And that goes for our country, too. Industry in our northern republics and oblasts, oil and gas recovery—all this has extremely painful ecological concomitants. And all the military activity—not merely on our part, of course—likewise inflicts dangerous wounds on the nature of the north.

"Taking all this into account, our Murmask program contained—along with other proposals on drawing up a general concept for the rational development of the northern regions, on coordinating scientific research, and on creating an integrated plan for protection of the environent of the north. [sentence as received]

"Soon after this program was put forward, matters relating to its implementation were discussed by the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the Council of the Union and of the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet. On 9 February 1988 the commissions adopted a letter to the parliaments and MP's of the states of northern Europe, the United States, and Canada. The sense of this document is simple: It contained a call for joint work to start implementing the ideas put forward by the Soviet leadership, on the understanding that there was a complete readiness to discuss and implement all other ideas capable of turning the northern areas of the planet into a zone of true peace and mutually beneficial cooperation.

"A number of specific steps were also proposed in the letter. In particular, the idea was advanced for a meeting to be held in Moscow between representatives of the parliaments of all interested states at which it would be possible 'to discuss the steps required for the ecological defense of the region.' The forum that begins on 31 January is precisely the practical realization of this idea.

"Of course, both concurring and divergent opinions will be voiced during the discussions. I am sure that the former will predominate, for in the long run, the peoples of all the countries taking part have an interest in ensuring that the climate in the north is governed by the warm Gulf Stream of the pan-European process rather than by the polar breath of the suspicions and prejudices that have accumulated in the past."

Zagladin Addresses Meeting

LD3102112189 Moscow TASS in English 1044 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 31 TASS—Environmental protection in the north of our planet is the subject of the first meeting of parliamentarians from the countries of northern Europe and Canada, which opened in the Soviet capital on Tuesday.

Vadim Zagladin, secretary of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet and advisor to the president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, addressed the meeting. He stressed that cooperation in the field of ecology should be free from ideological political confrontatons. "Deideologization of ecological cooperation paves the way for stronger trust between the countries in most diverse spheres," he said.

The forum represents a practical realization of the Soviet leadership's proposal made by Mikhail Gorbachev on October 1, 1987, in Murmansk, on cooperation of northern Europe countries in environmental protection.

The meeting is attended by MPs from the Soviet Union, Denmark, Canada, Iceland, Norway, Finland, Sweden and representatives of the embassies of countries which have an interest in the issues under discussion—the United States, Britain, the German Democratic Repubic, Poland and West Germany. The participants in the meeting will be received at the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Petrovskiy Urges Cooperation on Environment

PM0102105189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jan 89 Second Edition p 5

[Interview with V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, by A. Lyutyy under the rubric "Ecology": "Front of Struggle for Survival"—date, place not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] "The ecological situation in a number of regions is simply appalling." The words uttered by M.S. Gorbachev from the UN platform are a harsh but correct diagnosis made on the state of our planet's environment. It is also confirmed by the opinion of scientists. Many of

them believe that if urgent measures are not taken, then in a few decades the process of infecting man's environment may become irreversible. The problem of ecological safety is now being advanced as one of the priority avenues of international cooperation. An international meeting within the framework of the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP) ended a few days ago in Nairobi (Kenya). Fifteen states took part in it. Our correspondent met with V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister and head of the Soviet delegation.

[Petrovskiy] The meeting in Nairobi was for consultation and was called at the initiative of M. Tolba, executive director of UNEP. The meeting's aim was to exchange opinions about what must be the ecological strategy of states in the coming years and what mechanisms will be needed to implement it. It may be noted that the calling of the meeting was dictated, in particular, by the fact that for the first time—and this was discussed in Nairobi—the question was put at the highest political level in the United Nations, in our leader's speech, of ecological revival and the uniting of the efforts of states with this aim.

All the meeting's participants agreed that the ecological problem, which recently has become literally critical, is now at a level of significance and acuteness equivalent to such problems as disarmament and the settlement of regional conflicts and crisis situations.

It is very important that everyone realizes the existence of a directly proportional dependence between expanding international cooperation in the ecological sphere and the possibility of resolving ecological problems at home more quickly and efficiently, inasmuch as environmental pollution knows no national boundaries, ideological barriers, or obstacles. Mutual understanding was also reached on the point that international mechanisms need to be put into operation on a collective basis. An international conference on environmental protection to be held in 1992 within the UN framework is the reference point here for joint efforts.

[Lyutyy] How were the Soviet proposals on ecological problems, put forward by M.S. Gorbachev at the United Nations, interpreted in Nairobi?

[Petrovskiy] We were very pleased to note that essentially the entire dialogue took account of the Soviet proposals. Our proposal to set up an emergency ecological aid center was met with great interest. Moreover, in Nairobi we specified the content of this center's work, which could deal with analyzing and processing the results of observations received from governments with the aim of identifying critical ecological situations. It could also send experts to study the situation on the spot and prepare recommendations to governments, and deal with spreading early warnings and reports about accidents.

The Soviet proposal to set up an international space laboratory or a manned orbital station to monitor the state of nature also aroused interest.

[Lyutyy] In connection with the reductions in armed forces, arms, and the USSR military budget announced by our leadership, the question arises whether some of the money freed will be channeled into ecological purposes.

[Petrovskiy] At last year's Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee conference we and the other socialist countries stated officially that steps in the disarmament sphere must be accompanied by specific nature conservation measures. Under present conditions the international community is spending a quite insignificant amount of resources on ecological needs. For example, the UNEP budget runs to only $30 million. This is nothing in comparison to the daily military expenditure of each of the major military states.

[Lyutyy] How does the ecological situation in our country look in general terms?

[Petrovskiy] I shall not say that our country is looking at its best. We ourselves are perfectly aware of this. Ecology must be dealt with at state level. As you know, we have adopted a program of action in this sphere.

But we are also aware of another factor. Active participation in international cooperation and accession to the various conventions that severely limit environmental pollution are essential. And a lot remains to be done in this respect. I cannot fail to be concerned, for example, that we are participating in only a little over 60 of around 120 existing conventions on the environment. Probably, here too one needs to be based on our declared principle of the primacy of international law.

[Lyutyy] What is our attitude to the proposal by Jacques Delors, chairman of the EEC commission, to create an environmental protection agency which would also be open to participation by the continent's socialist countries?

[Petrovskiy] In principle we have a very positive attitude toward this kind of cooperation. Moreover, we believe that a great deal of positive experience has been accumulated here since the signing of the Helsinki agreements. Various programs are already being implemented successfully within the framework of the European Ecological Commission. Additional programs will also be created and organizational mechanisms formulated. This will only benefit the common cause.

On the subject of Europe, I must say that we share the concern of a number of countries at the deterioration of the ecological situation in the Arctic. It is important to accelerate the formulation of an international legal document regulating the joint activity of all countries in this region. This question should be resolved collectively.

[Lyutyy] Recently material has been appearing in our press on problems of burying the waste from the nuclear raw materials that we supply to other states.

[Petrovskiy] I think that this is one of the very serious questions. It is now worrying the international community. And it is no accident that at the last UN General Assembly session, out of five resolutions on ecology, three concerned precisely this problem. I think that we need to be guided by international standards and norms which, in particular, have been formulated at the IAEA. A search is under way—and we are taking part in it—for safe ways to bury this waste. In this sphere too, it is international cooperation that is likely to help us find an answer to internal problems emerging in our country.

United States & Canada

U.S. Criticized for 'Falsehoods' on Afghanistan

LD3101191389 Moscow TASS in English 1838 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 31 TASS—By TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov:

"The Soviets continue in Afghanistan a policy which can be described as a scorched-earth policy." This phrase appears on the pages of some American newspapers, is pronounced in commentaries over the radio and television. It could certainly be ignored if it were not for the fact that it originated not in some yellow paper specialising in anti-Soviet falsehoods, but with an official representative of the U.S. Department of State.

The question arises why this ill-intentioned falsehood was launched now?

The U.S. Department of State is surely well aware of what happens in Afghanistan now. Soviet troops are leaving that country strictly in keeping with the provisions of the Geneva accords. Soviet military transport planes land in Kabul one after another with loads of foodstuffs and fuel for the population of the Afghan capital.

A high-ranking Soviet delegation just held negotiations with the Afghan leadership in Kabul. It confirmed the Soviet Union's striving and readiness to continue giving all-round support to Afghanistan in achieving peace, developing its economic and social structures.

The political course of Moscow which, jointly with Kabul, is striving to achieve a comprehensive and just settlement to the Afghan problem, to do everything to stop the blood-letting and restore the country ravaged by the war lasting over many years meets with understanding and support of the international public.

The lingering impression from the falsehood which originated with the State Department is that its sole purpose is to slander this principled peaceful course. The impression persists that definite persons in the USA, having failed to achieve their aim by large-scale deliveries of armaments to "intransigent opposition" and by training and instigating terrorists, would like very much to undermine the settlement by lies.

If the inventors of falsehoods in the State Department were really concerned with the aggravation of the situation in Afghanistan, they could easily discover its causes precisely in the actions of "intransigent opposition" patronised by Washington. It is precisely members of that opposition, who with the use of American weapons continue barbarous rocketry shelling of peaceful Afghan cities and villages. It is they who try to combine armed terrorism with disorganisation of the country's economic life.

It is the actions of "intransigent opposition" that are precisely "a scorched-earth tactic". It is easy to see who trained them in this tactic. This was done by those who had used this tactic during the "dirty war" in Vietnam.

America might become a catalyst of the improvement of conditions and stability in Afghanistan, a White House spokesman said in Washington, quoting a pronouncement by the President of the USA. A laudable intention. But do they in the State Department really think that allegations and instigation of "intransigent opposition" are the best ways to ensure that the USA really becomes such a catalyst?

Daily Views TIME Editors' Profile of Bush

PM0102092589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 31 Jan 89 p 7

[Article by observer Gennadiy Gerasimov under the rubric "The World on Tuesday": "Sketching a Portrait"]

[Text] The editors of the U.S. weekly TIME have published a book entitled "The Winning of the White House, 1988" on last year's presidential election campaign, its main protagonists, and the winner, Bush, whose photograph in his moment of triumph is displayed on the cover.

We will leave aside the election campaign itself—its ups and downs are still fresh in people's memories. We will also leave the loser in peace. It would be more interesting to look a little more closely at the character of the winner, because the world is going to have to do business with him over the next 4 years—or the next 8 years, if he wins the next election.

For the 8 years prior to this, as the book points out, George Bush has deliberately stayed in the president's shadow. For this reason, his political face has been very hard to define and has been more a reflection of the incumbent president's image. For example, when Ronald Reagan was running for the nomination in the 1980 primaries, his rival, Bush, described Reagan's plan to cut taxes, increase military expenditure, and simultaneously balance the budget as "voodoo economics." The authors of the book note that Bush was right at the time but that "opportunism gained the upper hand over principle" and "Bush accepted what he had recently condemned."

On the other hand, Bush showed himself a loyal "member of the team," never crossing his boss and never revealing the content of his conversations with him to anyone.

One political rival of his complained, as a result of this: "I sometimes feel that I could stretch out my hand—and it would go right through him."

In order to gain a better insight into Bush's character and views, the authors of the book refer to his biography, particularly the period of his childhood. According to "psychohistory," the character traits of future political

leaders are established in childhood. By studying childhood pastimes and pleasures and also the family situation, it is possible to speculate on the actions of a certain political figure in various situations with a greater degree of certainty.

Bush has been secretive since childhood: His family never "verbalized relationships," preferring to get on and build them. His mother taught him not to talk about himself. Bush has often warned journalists not to try to lay him out on the psychoanalyst's couch.

His mother was strict in demanding that all duties be carried out—even the most insignificant, such as switching off the light when leaving the room, for example. The children paid for their own telephone calls (in the United States calls are registered on automatic meters). His father offered no recommendations on how to live, believing that his own personal example was sufficient. When, at the age of 18, Bush decided to become a bomber pilot, his father nodded his head and shook his hand....

In the large family in which the young George grew up he had the reputation of "peacemaker," because he never started arguments himself, was always prepared to back down, and was nicknamed "fifty-fifty George," because he was always ready to share everything with the others, saying "let's go halves!"

Now the authors of the book write of his "political vagueness," citing, among other examples, the "voodoo economics" episode: This expression has become popular and has been used as ammunition by Reagan's political opponents.

His strict upbringing has taught Bush to be independent and hardworking. He was a diligent, assiduous student, although, if we are to believe the authors of the book, "he can only maintain attention for a limited period of time" and is sometimes "short on patience." This obviously contradicts their own observations regarding the 8 years of patient waiting and his reticence in expressing an opinion.

Now Bush has begun to speak out loud and strong.

"Bush the politician is influenced not so much by ideology as by people," the book says. "People are closer to him than ideas.... As a young man and later on in life, George has preferred action to deliberation."

These are some of the features that go to make up the portrait of the new American President as presented by TIME magazine, whose correspondents spent thousands of hours covering his election campaign and followed his every move.

Now everyone will be watching to see—and the introduction offered by TIME may help—how the book by George Bush himself, mentioned in this column 2 weeks ago and translated into Russian by "Progress" Publishers, will be able to help [sentence as published].

Senate Confirmation of Bush Appointees Noted

PM3101115989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Blinov dispatch: "U.S. Administration Confirmed"]

[Text] Washington—The U.S. Congress Senate is confirming the appointments G. Bush made last Wednesday. U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker was the first member of the cabinet to be confirmed by the senators.

In the opinion of the press, 58-year old lawyer Baker will be a key figure in the new Republican inner cabinet [komnata]. He is the cabinet member closest to Bush; their political careers became intertwined 20 years ago.

Baker's Senate confirmation went without a hitch. He was supported by conservatives and liberals alike. At hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee, where he spent 2 days answering questions, Baker demonstrated, according to the press, "excellent knowledge of his new sphere of activity," even though it is only a few years since he first ran into foreign policy.

In response to a question about his approach to relations with the USSR, Baker advanced an opinion in the spirit of Bush's election statements. According to him, the United States is interested in improving relations with the Soviet Union and broadening dialogue between the two countries on global problems. At the same time he stated that the new administration will act "with circumspection" and confirmed the previous administration's well-known stances on a number of international problems.

On the same day the Senate confirmed Elizabeth Dole as U.S. secretary of labor and Richard Darman as director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Elizabeth Dole is 52 years old. She is married to R. Dole, Republican minority leader in the Senate, who was Bush's rival in the first stage of the 1988 election campaign. She was secretary of transportation in the Reagan administration.

One of the youngest leaders of the new administration is 45-year-old Richard Darman, son of a rich northeastern textile manufacturing family and a graduate from the Harvard School of Management. Under President Reagan he was a White House staffer with responsibility for its legislative initiatives and an assistant secretary of the treasury. Darman is well known as a vigorous advocate of measures to boost the competitiveness of U.S. companies on the world market.

Scowcroft Remark on Continued Cold War Challenged

PM3101144589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
29 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own political observer Vikentiy Matveyev article under the rubric "Events and Opinions": "Has the 'Cold War' Ended?"]

[Text] In the West at present it is possible to come across the most diverse views about the situation which is taking shape in the world. At the same time, it is not difficult to notice how widely the views of official representatives diverge, views which until recently were marked by unanimity, at least where key questions of foreign policy were concerned.

Has the "cold war" ended?—is one such question, and it is by no means an abstract or theoretical question. The unequivocal statement by British head of government M. Thatcher that this "war" is over has given rise to a fairly lively discussion. Most people agree with her, but there are a number of noteworthy exceptions. Noteworthy, because the objections come from influential people, such as, for instance, Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft, who has been appointed by George Bush to the post of presidential national security adviser.

"The 'cold war' is still on," he said a few days ago, adding that "there is light at the end of the tunnel" to soften the categorical nature of his remark, although, according to his view, the nature of the light is not clear yet: "It could be the rising sun, or an oncoming locomotive...."

This is no scholastic dispute. The correct assessment of the situation is a guideline for action. Should military expenditure be increased or decreased? Should arms be cut back? Is it necessary to respond to the new bold initiatives of the USSR? This is what is at the focus of attention.

"Cold war"... This term was first used by Bernard Baruch, a U.S. banker and politician, in April 1947, when ominous clouds were gathering in the sky of international politics. The ensuing armament fever was the most powerful ferment in the atmosphere of mutual distrust, fear, and hostility.

A great deal could be said about the prime cause of a whipping up of tension of this kind. I will confine myself to recalling the U.S. nuclear arms race which began immediately after the war, and which gathered momentum under the anti-Soviet banner even at a time when the United States had a monopoly in this sphere.

The desire of one of the sides to exert decisive pressure on the other is, in the opinion of the author of this commentary, what lay at the root of the "cold war" strategy. It took decades rather than years for both sides to reach the conclusion that this course of action was futile, and, what is more, extremely risky.

In this context, the positive changes which have taken place, especially in the last 2-3 years, in relations between socialist and capitalist states indicate that the "cold war" is receding into the past, that it no longer determines the political climate in the world.

So, on what does Lieutenant General Scowcroft base his view that the "cold war" is still on? He bases it on his claim that the USSR wants to sow discord within the Western alliance, and believes that the best way to achieve this is a peace offensive rather than the intimidation to which the USSR resorted in the past....

The author has reproduced Scowcroft's words without adding or omitting anything. I must frankly admit that they pose a big puzzle. Why, and how, should the practical measures, including bilateral measures, proposed by our country and aimed at a substantial reduction of the very high levels of military confrontation between the USSR and the United States and between NATO and the Warsaw Pact "sow discord inside the alliance of Western countries"?

Many statesmen and other figures in West European capitals and the United States itself have responded positively to these measures. This is not surprising if you take into account what the situation was like before, what tension there was in Europe and in the world in general, when the two sides not only did not conclude any accords, but did not even engage in elementary dialogue at the negotiating table for a relatively long period. It was not fortuitous that during those years the phrase about the "dialogue of the deaf" came into being.

Now there are many forums where key questions are being discussed. This does not mean, of course, that perfect harmony is being established in the world. That is still a long way off. There are quite a few serious difficulties in the path of current and future negotiations, which are partly due to the nature of the problems under discussion. However, all this has little in common with the atmosphere which prevailed during the "cold war" years. Sound shoots of the new developments which must ensure the peaceful fate of our planet, rather than seeds of discord, are sprouting in the soil of international relations.

Hans-Dietrich Genscher, FRG foreign minister, was hardly engaging in wishful thinking when he said in mid-January: "We are advancing along a path which leads from the militarization to the humanization of international relations. The disarmament process is irrepressible. And no one has the power to halt it."

Incidentally, even Brent Scowcroft has quite a few constructive statements to his name. He has taken part in many conferences attended by Soviet representatives. Therefore his words ascribing to us something that does not exist are all the more surprising. The progress toward an integrated world, the switch from confrontation to mutual understanding and collaboration—even on such delicate questions as human rights and other issues

which, it seemed, could never bring together representatives of different world outlooks at one table—this process calls for the greatest possible consensus rather than discord.

By putting different constructions on the nature of the "cold war" it is possible to argue about how far it has receded into the past. So there is nothing unusual about the current debate in the West on this issue. The desire to clarify viewpoints is a natural impulse. Unfortunately, in my view, B. Scowcroft was guided by something else in his remarks. What he said about our country is reminiscent of the stereotypes of the "cold war" which has itself already become part of history.

(Editor's note: Just before this edition of the newspaper went to print, a report was received from Washington that President G. Bush had expressed his disagreement at a news conference with Brent Scowcroft's view that the "cold war" is still continuing.)

Tower's 'Lone Voice' Warns of 'Soviet Threat'
PM0102102189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Feb 89 Morning Edition p 4

[V. Matveyev article under the "Pertinent Comments" rubric: "Thankless Task"]

[Text] The first speech that former Senator John Tower made in his new role as U.S. defense secretary attracted press attention. He used to be one of the most zealous supporters of the arms race in the Congress. While the Congress was examining his candidacy for the new post, Tower even ventured to criticize certain military programs for being too costly. He spoke without enthusiasm about the "Star Wars" program. It was obvious that he wanted to appear flexible to his former colleagues on Capitol Hill and no stranger to the sentiments gathering pace within the United States in favor of economizing on military expenditure.

Now, following the Senate's ratification of his candidacy, Tower has shown up in Munich at a conference of the "Wehrkunde" military scientific society, and delivered a speech there that provoked comments not for its rationality but for its stress on negative elements. Thus, he asserted that "there may be a thaw in the 'cold war,' but the threat remains."

He made an insistent appeal to NATO countries' governments not to relax but rather to step up their efforts in the military sphere. He meant specifically the modernization of tactical nuclear weapons, the bulk of which are on FRG territory.

It is easy to guess how the Pentagon chief tried to justify this appeal. He agreed with his predecessors' thesis of the "Soviet threat." There's nothing new in that.

Something else is new—the atmosphere at this, the 26th successive meeting of this society. Quite recently everything said there on the topic of the "Soviet threat" was eagerly taken up by the audience. This time Tower's was more or less a lone voice.

Of course, the leitmotiv of the speeches at this forum, which met under NATO auspices, was not disarmament. But at the same time one could detect a clear distinction between what the Pentagon chief said and what most of the other participants in the meeting said. The debate revolved around the question of how NATO should act in a situation that is significantly different from that observed on our continent throughout the postwar period.

John Tower has taken on a thankless task. Because, if you listen to him, it looks as though the Soviet Union's reduction of forces, equal in size to the Bundeswehr, is some kind of "menacing step"! Who can be convinced by such speeches? Is their author himself convinced of them?

Lastly, how can he demand that his allies increase their military expenditure when the U.S. Administration itself intends to carry out serious studies into the possibility of managing with smaller appropriations for Pentagon budget sections?

If people there want to compensate for their own savings by increasing West European military expenditure, that kind of tactic could provoke an adverse reaction among the U.S. allies.

One can see from Tower's speech which NATO country is now the main target for transatlantic pressure. It is the FRG. The largest U.S. forces are concentrated there. People in Washington reckon that even more sophisticated nuclear weapons in the form of new tactical missiles should be sited there on this bridgehead. Hence the plan to modernize these weapons bearing the U.S. stamp.

Why not eliminate these arms altogether, in both NATO and Warsaw Pact countries? This solution has been proposed and is still on the agenda. It has also won support among people in NATO circles.

We shall see what we shall see and how events develop. It will be increasingly difficult for the authors of this unscrupulous propaganda to allude to an external threat that does not exist.

Yakovlev, Jesse Jackson Confer on World Relations
LD3101174289 Moscow TASS in English 1719 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 31 TASS—Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Secretary and Politburo member Aleksandr Yakovlev and Jesse Jackson, a prominent member of the U.S. Democratic Party, agreed that there are very favorable opportunities for a new development of Soviet-U.S. contacts in all fields when they met here Tuesday.

They had a substantive discussion of Soviet-American relations and the world situation.

Jackson said that these relations and ongoing positive changes in the world were being greatly influenced by processes under way in the Soviet Union and new-thinking policy in international affairs.

He said that the humanist vision of the world and universally shared values, described by Mikhail Gorbachev in his U.N. speech last month, had won enthusiastic support among broad sections of American people.

Jackson spoke highly of perestroyka and glasnost in the Soviet Union and was told in detail about the processes of democratization in Soviet society, especially those in the fields of culture and people-to-people relations.

He spoke of his plans to organize a series of benefit concerts featuring American and Soviet performers to raise funds for earthquake victims in Armenia.

Yakovlev thanked Jackson for his part in the noble effort.

Petrovskiy Receives Harvard School Director

LD3101141589 Moscow TASS in English 1352 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 31 TASS—Vladimir Petrovskiy, deputy Soviet foreign minister, received Professor Graham Allison, director of Harvard University School of Government on Monday.

They discussed a wide range of questions about the role of scientists in the development of international relations and the maximum use of Soviet and American scientific potential for the creation of a democratic and civilised world order.

China

Shevardnadze Leaves for Official Visit to PRC

Slyunkov, Others See Him Off

LD0102073889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 1 Feb 89

[Text] Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR foreign minister, left Moscow for Beijing on an official visit today. There will also be a short working visit to Pakistan.

At the airport, Comrade Shevardnadze was seen off by Comrade Slyunkov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee; Comrade Kovalev, USSR first deputy foreign minister, and other officials. Among those seeing him off were Yu Hongliang, the ambassador of the PRC to the USSR; and (Jaffur), Pakistani charge d'affaires ad interim in the USSR.

In an interview prior to his departure, Comrade Shevardnadze pointed to the growing intensity of contacts between the Soviet Union and China. This process corresponds to the desire of the two countries to elevate their relations to a new higher level. The main aim of the visit is to complete preparations for the Soviet-Chinese summit.

Visit Will Help Normalize Ties

LD3101163689 Moscow TASS in English 1622 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 31 TASS—By TASS political news analyst Mikhail Yakovlev:

An event of major importance for Soviet-Chinese relations is about to take place. USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze will visit the People's Republic of China.

The heads of the foreign policy departments of the USSR and the PRC met thrice over the past year and conducted negotiations. Questions raised during the talks with Foreign Minister of China Qian Qichen in Moscow last December are expected to be continued in Beijing. Moreover, concrete practical decisions are to be made on a number of questions.

This applies first of all to a Soviet-Chinese summit. Without doubt such a meeting will be a veritable breakthrough in the process of complete normalisation of relations between the USSR and the PRC.

Life itself demands the return of bilateral relations into a normal route.

Radical reforms in the economic, social, political and other areas have been made in the PRC over ten years now.

Questions of economic and political restructuring are being decided in the Soviet Union. There is much in common in these processes even though they take place in different specific conditions and are conducted by various methods.

The Soviet Communist Party and the Communist Party of China wish to attach a new look to socialism in their countries. Complete normalisation of Soviet-Chinese relations will create a solid basis for cooperation, mutual support, the study of each other's experience, as political directives, questions of theory and the very practice of socialist construction need be constantly upgraded.

Normalisation of Soviet-Chinese relations will give much to peoples of both countries and will also have a positive effect on the situation in Asia. In the Pacific

region, in the world community as a whole. Both countries are interested in creating a new political world order. And they confirm this striving by their clear-cut position on major international problems, by their practical actions.

The USSR and the PRC declare for complete elimination of nuclear, chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, for a considerable reduction of conventional armaments, for the prevention of militarisation of outer space. Both countries supported the proposals for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones. The PRC has already reduced its Army by one million men. The Soviet Union announced the reduction of its Armed Forces by 500,000 men.

The decades of alienation are certainly still felt. There are differences on separate matters, echoes of previous theories are still heard, which is manifested, specifically, in the approaches to the military presence in the Pacific, in Asia.

But advancing to complete normalisation of Soviet-Chinese relations, it is important to look forward, not back. Normalisation of these relations opens broad opportunities for cooperation jointly with other countries in the protection of peace and security of peoples.

The Soviet and Chinese peoples covered a long road of friendship and mutually advantageous cooperation. Striving for complete normalisation of their relations, they do not intend to return, for instance, to the relations they had in the fifties. Times are different now. Realities are different.

The two countries wish to build their relations on the basis of the principles of equality, non-interference in internal affairs, consideration for each other's interests, views, experience and practice. And, certainly, complete normalisation of Soviet-Chinese relations is not fraught with any damage for the interests of third countries.

Full Potential Not Yet Tapped

LD0102065189 Moscow TASS in English 0638 GMT 1 Feb 89

[Text] Moscow February 1 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and USSR minister of foreign affairs, leaves for Beijing for an official visit today. This will be the first-ever official visit to China by a Soviet foreign minister.

It is believed in the Soviet Union that to normalise Soviet-Chinese relations is a process which accords with the desire of both the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. The two countries began to advance towards this goal long ago.

A continuous political dialogue is being conducted, consultations and talks on border issues are being held, and exchanges of national exhibitions and delegations of various kind are being practised. Economic and trade cooperation gains in scope, and direct contacts are being established between regions and cities, institutions and enterprises.

At the same time there is awareness in Moscow that the potential of Soviet-Chinese relations has not yet been tapped to the full and that it may give a good deal more to both our two peoples, the Asian region, and the international community as a whole. It is believed in the Soviet Union in this connection that only a meeting of top leaders of the countries—a Soviet-Chinese summit—can give the necessary impetus to full normalisation of Soviet-Chinese relations. The importance of Eduard Shevardnadze's visit is first of all in the fact that it virtually caps preparations for a Soviet-Chinese summit.

One can say already now that both the Soviet and Chinese sides are interested in the establishment of a world political order with an emphasis on dialogue, cooperation, peace and development. It is important to emphasize in this connection that full normalisation of Soviet-Chinese relations is not fraught with any damage to the interests of third countries.

Trip Basis for Optimism

PM3101130089 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Boris Vasilyev article: "The Logic of Good-Neighborliness"]

[Text] E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, will pay an official visit to the PRC 2-4 February.

A brief report transmitted by the XINHUA agency the other day: From the border city of Heihe in Northeast China you can clearly see the Soviet city of Blagoveshchensk, on the opposite bank of the Heilongjiang (the Chinese name for the Amur river).... In winter, when the river is frozen over, a bus full of Soviet tourists arrives in Heihe in the morning. After a tour of the city, at 1900 hours, the guests go home. The next day Chinese tourists from Heihe make the trip to Blagoveshchensk... At the end of last year an agreement was signed under which both sides will exchange groups of tourists, with 40 in each group, every week....

Eighty tourists, once a week! And that is between two neighboring great powers whose population is nearly 1.5 billion, one-third of mankind!

Alas, our relations have developed in such a way in recent decades that even this report cannot but give us all a natural sense of satisfaction. We are looking at one more fact among many others indicating that the days

that cast a distressing cloud over the traditional Soviet-Chinese friendship are receding into the past. Both our socialist states are actively taking the necessary steps to restore Soviet-Chinese relations to their normal channel. Our links in the sphere of economy, culture, science, and technology have developed particularly rapidly in recent years.

The year 1988 was an important stage in the establishment of full-scale Soviet-Chinese political dialogue historically oriented toward friendship, cooperation, and mutual understanding. This dialogue began in the course of the first visit to Moscow for more than 30 years, by PRC Foreign Minister Qian Qichen. During the Chinese minister's meeting with M.S. Gorbachev and his talks with E.A. Shevardnadze, as the press noted at the time, a frank exchange of opinions took place on a wide range of problems of a bilateral, regional, and world nature. The talks revealed the sides' total agreement that political means of settling global and regional problems have succeeded the period of bloc, hegemonist, and strong-arm politics, while the world community is turning increasingly to the economy, to ecology, and to other vitally important tasks. But the main result of the Moscow meeting was the accord on holding a summit meeting in Beijing in the first half of this year between comrades M.S. Gorbachev and Deng Xiaoping. This event will undoubtedly mark the start of a new stage in Soviet-Chinese relations, raise them to a much higher level, and have a positive effect on the international situation in general.

However, in order to ensure the successful holding of the meeting between our two countries' leaders, a large volume of work remains to be done. And it is to this end that E.A. Shevardnadze is to pay an official visit to the PRC this week. Speaking about his forthcoming lofty mission, the USSR foreign minister stressed that "the wide range of problems sketched out in Moscow should be supplemented by concrete practical decisions in Beijing. We would like these to take the form of appropriate documents. After all, ultimately the two visits—Comrade Qian Qichen's to Moscow and ours to Beijing—are intended to prepare for a summit meeting that is fruitful in terms of its results, in which our peoples and, I would make so bold as to say, the world community have a vital interest. We have every reason to look optimistically to the future. There is a real basis for that optimism."

Soviet people have faith in the success of the forthcoming talks in Beijing, because positive results from them are fully in accordance with the vital aspirations of our peoples, who are resolving the historic tasks of renewing their countries' economic and political systems.

Soviet Desires for Good PRC Ties Reaffirmed

OW0102073389 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 25 Jan 89

[Text] A new book entitled "A Turn for Peace in Asia" written by noted Sinologists Kapitsa and (Yevseyev) has been published by the Moscow Political Publishing House. The book analyzes the current international relations in the Asia and Pacific region and expounds in detail on the position adopted by the Soviet Union concerning Asian affairs. The book touches on the question of Soviet-Chinese relations in particular. The following is a comment on this by our observer Belov.

The central idea of this book is that the Soviet Union and China, the two big powers in Asia, have always occupied a position of particular importance in the vast area of Asia and the Pacific. If the relations between the Soviet Union and China are friendly and good-neighborly, they will have a most favorable impact on the political situation in the Asia and Pacific region. Conversely, if the relations between them are not good, the entire political situation in Asia will be (?adversely affected). In the 1980's, relations between the Soviet Union and China have begun the trend toward the better. This, to a considerable extent, has been because of the fact that our country has made enormous efforts to improve our relations with China by actively seeking good-neighborly and friendly ties with China.

There are many glorious chapters in the history of Soviet-Chinese relations. Following the Great October Socialist Revolution, the Soviet Government's view concerning Soviet-China relations was that Soviet Russia and China were natural allies, and the two countries had always treated each other in this way. This attitude was also supported by political activists of vision in China at the time. Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the great (?nationalist) revolutionary, said, for instance, he hoped that when Soviet Russia and China became as close as brothers to each other they would be able to march forward hand in hand toward a great goal. The 27th CPSU Congress in 1986 summed up the work done by the party and state for the purpose of improving Soviet-Chinese relations and made (?predictions concerning) the prospects for the future. The CPSU Central Committee noted in its political report to the congress that it can be said with satisfaction that there have been some improvements in relations between the Soviet Union and socialist China, its great neighbor. There may still be differences between the two countries' attitudes—their views on some international issues, for instance. Nevertheless, it is our opinion that the two countries can cooperate in many areas by (?acting in coordination) with each other on the basis of equality and principle, and each will not harm the interests of the other by doing so. As for the future, it can be said that there are tremendous potentials for the Soviet Union and China to cooperate with each other. The reason that the potentials are great is because our cooperation is in accord with our own interests. (?It is also because) the peoples of our two countries believe that the most precious concept is that socialism and peace are inseparable.

It has been less than 3 years since the publication of the above statement, and the relations between the Soviet Union and China have already turned for the better with remarkable results. The most outstanding result is that

there will be a Soviet-Chinese summit in the first half of this year. The leaders of our two countries both feel that the summit should conclude the process of normalization of relations between our two countries.

The authors of the book "A Turn for Peace in Asia" point out that history has entrusted the Soviet and Chinese peoples with a very important mission. There is the possibility for us to successfully fulfill this mission. The key lies in our efforts to take full advantage of this possibility. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, our country has the sincere desire to establish a good relationship with socialist China.

Article Describes PRC Foreign Policy Development
PM3101100189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jan 89 Second Edition p 4

[PRAVDA political observer Vsevolod Ovchinnikov article: "In the Spirit of the Time. Evolution of China's Foreign Policy"]

[Text] During the PRC foreign minister's official visit to our country the Chinese leadership voiced for the first time, and confirmed at a CPC Central Committee Politburo session at the end of the year, a foreign policy concept which, as far as I can judge, met with interest in Moscow and which is, in my opinion, consonant in many respects with our ideas of new political thinking.

People in Beijing formulate this as follows: Crucial changes are taking place in the current international atmosphere. There is a move from confrontation to dialogue and from tension to detente. Peace and development have become the main trend in the modern era. It is time to put forward the five principles for peaceful coexistence as the basis for a new international political order.

RENMIN RIBAO mentioned that in the fifties China—along with neighboring Asian countries—proposed respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual nonaggression, noninterference in one another's internal affairs, equality and mutual advantage, and peaceful coexistence as the fundamental principles for interstate relations. It is now a question of ensuring that these five principles become a universal norm. On this basis China is endeavoring to establish, restore, or develop relations with all states irrespective of their social systems and ideology, live with them in harmony, and develop friendly cooperation.

The CPC Central Committee Politburo defined the country's current foreign policy guidelines as follows: to help develop the international situation so as to alleviate it over a long period of time; to continue the struggle against hegemonism and strong-arm politics; to initiate the creation of a new international political order based on the five principles for peaceful coexistence; and to secure the establishment of a new international economic order based on equality and mutual advantage.

The Politburo session pointed out that over the last few years China has made important amendments to its foreign policy, which should continue to be improved in the light of changes in the situation and the generalization of experience.

Chinese foreign policy began to evolve after the course of reforms and openness was proclaimed. Its implementation made it necessary to subordinate foreign policy to tasks of internal development and create favorable external conditions for modernizing the country. It was necessary to regard the world around more soberly and realistically and abandon the geopolitical plans of the seventies like "the united front of resistance to Soviet hegemonism." The 12th CPC Congress (1982) described China's independence, autonomy, and refusal to ally itself or enter into strategic partnership with any of the leading world powers as the cornerstone of its foreign policy. These tenets predetermined China's more balanced and rational approach to international affairs.

The 13th CPC Congress (1987) confirmed the thesis concerning the independence and autonomy of China's foreign policy course and named peace and development as the main problems of the day (the word "peace" means East-West relations, and the word "development" means North-South relations). Beijing is now increasingly stressing the role of economic factors in shaping foreign policy. As China is drawn into the international division of labor, it is becoming increasingly aware of the increase in states' economic interdependence.

The over-simplified view of international life as the arena for rivalry between "the two superpowers" has given way to a fuller expression: "One world with two social systems, political and economic polycentrism, competition and cooperation." The idea has been expressed that national security is not only dependent now on the size of military potential, and that only a "state's combined might" (the level of its economic, scientific, and technical development) determines its clout in the international arena. People in Beijing believe that the trend to multipolarity has come to replace the U.S. and USSR dominance characteristic of the world in the postwar years.

The evolution of China's foreign policy enables us to draw two conclusions. On the one hand this policy has, as it were, become more down-to-earth, divested itself of far-fetched plans and subjective factors, and become clearly oriented toward the practical requirements of internal development. On the other hand, China's overall involvement in world affairs has, indisputably, grown deeper, and its positive effect on the course of events and on the resolution of global problems has increased. There is no contradiction here since the long-term aims of socialist modernization require peace and cooperation, that is, they are in the mainstream of general human interests.

China is taking a more realistic view of the world, and this is making an impact on its approach to all the urgent problems of the day. China has abandoned the thesis of the inevitability of another world war, and now adheres to the stance that a nuclear conflict—which would be disastrous for mankind—can be prevented. Chinese leaders' speeches acknowledge the PRC's responsibility as a nuclear power for the cause of disarmament.

China's approach to the problem of mankind's survival can be expounded briefly as follows. The nuclear arms race poses a serious threat to international peace and security. The end aim must be to ban and completely eliminate nuclear weapons.

It is good that the USSR and the United States have taken the first step toward this. Since they possess the largest and most modern arsenals, the superpowers bear particular responsibility for the disarmament process and must play a leading role in it. If the USSR and the United States sharply reduce the stocks they have accumulated and abandon the production, testing, and deployment of new nuclear weapons, favorable conditions will emerge for an international conference to be convened and for the other nuclear powers to join in the disarmament process.

Beijing proposes that all nuclear-capable countries pledge never to use these weapons first under any circumstances, or use them or threaten to use them against nonnuclear states or nuclear-free zones. (China's proposal to conclude an international convention on this basis echoes analogous Soviet initiatives. So why shouldn't the two great socialist powers not set an example by repudiating nuclear deterrence toward one another under international law?).

China categorically opposes the militarization of space, which should, in its opinion, be used exclusively for peaceful purposes, for the good of all mankind. Space weapons must be banned. An international convention should also be urgently concluded on the banning and complete elimination of chemical weapons.

Conventional arms, which should exclusively serve to meet self-defense needs, should also be substantially reduced along with mass destruction systems. In 1985 China cut its Armed Forces by 1 million men. Many military enterprises have switched to civilian needs. During the reform years the country's military budget has been substantially reduced. China does not approve of the practice of deploying troops and creating military bases outside national borders. (Let me add that during the Soviet moratorium, China refrained from nuclear testing, as of 1986 it stopped nuclear tests in the atmosphere, and it declares its adherence to the principles of nuclear weapons nonproliferation).

Last, the final thesis. Disarmament problems affect the security interests of all states, and so they must all—large and small, rich and poor, strong and weak—participate on an equal basis in discussing and resolving questions linked with disarmament; moreover, the United Nations is the best forum for this.

It is gratifying that Beijing by and large reacted positively to the Soviet head of state's UN speech. The results of the Sino-Indian summit are gratifying, as is the resumption of direct dialogue between Beijing and Hanoi.

People in Beijing stress that strengthening solidarity and cooperation with the "Third World" is an important avenue in Chinese foreign policy. China resolutely opposes imperialism, colonialism, and racism, and supports developing countries' just struggle to strengthen their national independence. China advocates the political settlement of regional conflicts (although its approach to the problems of Cambodia and Afghanistan differs from the Soviet approach). As for the Near East, South Africa, and Central America, Beijing and Moscow's stance on these "hotspots" practically coincide. China supports the DPRK's proposal regarding the peaceful reunification of this country on the basis of dialogue and opposes any actions that exacerbate tension on the Korean Peninsula.

In the last few years there has been a marked increase in the Chinese leadership's attention to the Asia-Pacific region as the main sphere of the country's political and economic interests. That is why China's statement of its readiness to "work jointly with other countries in the region to turn the Pacific into an ocean of peace, friendship, and cooperation" is extremely valuable. Regarding the increase in regional cooperation as a positive trend, Beijing cautions against protectionism; it emphasizes that under contemporary conditions no individual country and no individual region will be able to secure prosperity by keeping its doors closed. For its part, China has made its openness known through its strategy for the maritime regions, with their population of 160 million, and has set itself the goal of bringing foreign capital and sometimes raw materials there in order to create labor-intensive export-oriented production units.

The more realistic view of the USSR, its foreign policy in general, and its approach to China in particular are bearing fruit. People in Beijing can see that in its relations with other socialist countries and fraternal communist parties Moscow is guided strictly by the principles of mutual respect and sovereign equality. The closeness of the aims of the Chinese reforms and Soviet restructuring has given rise to mutual interest in exchanging concrete experience in renewing socialism.

"The new development of Chinese-Soviet relations was one of the most important events of 1988 attracting the whole world's attention," PRC Foreign Minister Qian Qichen stated. "The normalization of relations between

two major powers—China and the Soviet Union—based on the five principles for peaceful coexistence will indisputably promote peace in Asia and throughout the world."

When comparing PRC and USSR foreign policy concepts you can see for yourself that the two countries' approaches to key problems of the day are extremely close or coincide (although there are still differences of opinion on individual issues). However, one cannot fail to see that there is tremendous untapped potential for cooperation between the two socialist powers in resolving global problems. By cooperating with one another, our countries could do considerably more on a global scale to prevent nuclear ecological catastrophe; restore peace and justice in the planet's "hotspots"; and reduce military activity, strengthen confidence and security, and create more favorable conditions for economic cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region.

Unfortunately, the echoes of the former theories regarding the "hegemonism of the two superpowers" sometimes impel Beijing to react cautiously to Soviet initiatives on the Asia-Pacific region and treat them in the context of USSR-U.S. rivalry for influence in Asia.

However, both China and the USSR have their foreign policy priorities, their international commitments, and their specific interests. So it would be unrealistic to expect complete coincidence of positions on all questions. But this must not impede the development of cooperation.

From this viewpoint the evolution of Chinese foreign policy in the last decade inspires optimism. With its current constructive approach, China is seeking mutually acceptable forms of coexistence with other states in the diverse and contradictory, but integral world.

I want to reiterate that the concept of a new international order that has been put forward in Beijing is, in my opinion, close in essence to the fundamental principles of Soviet foreign policy and accords with the spirit of the new thinking. This engenders the hope that cooperation between our countries in the international arena will be even more active and effective.

Bureaucratic Obstacles Swept Aside in PRC Reform

PM3101154589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Jan 89 First Edition p 3

[A. Shapovalov article under the rubric "From the Travel Notebook": "Sixteen Days in China"]

[Excerpt] Beijing, Moscow—[passage omitted] Marking the 10th anniversary of its reforms, the tasks of which were determined by the Third CPC Central Committee Plenum, 11th Convocation (December 1978), China is taking a look at the ground it has covered so far and is summing up the results. During this time its gross national product has more than doubled and its export and import volumes have quadrupled. The rate of economic development has been 2-4 times higher than in industrially developed capitalist countries, although much of this, of course, has been achieved using extensive methods of economic management. The real income of the peasantry has almost trebled and that of the urban population has almost doubled. This is primarily connected with the awakening of social energy and with the contract, which, sweeping aside bureaucratic obstacles, has opened the way to initiative and creativity, broadened people's rights, and, at the same time, increased their responsibility.

The end result is truly impressive: The overwhelming majority of the billion-strong population is now fed, clothed, and shod. But no one I talked to tried to pass this off as some miracle. They stressed the point that everything has been achieved through the hard work of the whole nation.

Not many people are opposed to the reform, because it has on its side some 1,700 legal documents and—most important of all—the people, who can see for themselves that, as a rule, the reform has made things better today than they were yesterday and not the other way around. But there are problems, nevertheless. Prices are rising rapidly and inflation is increasing. Too many investments have been channeled into capital construction and the building of nonproduction projects. The difficulties, however, are not glossed over, the mistakes and shortcomings are admitted, and measures instantly suggested to eliminate them. The public is always kept informed about everything, which rules out the possibility of rumors.

What are the aims of China's restructuring? A great deal of light was shed on the subject by Wu Yufeng, deputy chief of the PRC State Restructuring of the Economic System Commission's Theory and Propaganda Department. First of all, there is the reform in rural areas, where the overwhelming majority of the country's population lives (80 percent). They have disbanded the "people's communes," in which the peasantry was essentially placed in a barracks-like situation, and abandoned the policies of leveling and sustaining the nation from "the same common pot." Collectively owned land has been transferred to the contract system (family contracts and collective contracts, but mainly family contracts). And the peasants have begun—without any coercion—to work conscientiously, because they realize that they are working primarily for themselves.

Production relations between the peasantry and the local leadership are now regulated in a new way. Previously, with the communes, a system of apportionment was in operation, but now contracts and agreements are used. The peasants pay a 3-percent tax and give 7 percent of the harvest to the collective's (the village's) social fund, which is needed to pay for construction, land reclamation and irrigation, and other work. Forty percent of the harvest is sold to the state; equipment and fertilizers are

supplied on preferential terms in return. The peasants can dispose of the remaining harvest at their own discretion. They can sell it to the state or take it to market and, what is more, in any area and without any restrictions.

Incidentally, in 1984 China harvested 402 million tonnes of grain for the first time in its history. The dynamics of grain production are as follows: 1949—200 million; 1979—300 million; 1984—402 million tonnes. Notice how it took only 5 years to reach the next 100 million mark.

The reform in the cities—primarily in industry—means that the right of ownership of production facilities is still enjoyed by the state but the right to use these facilities has been transferred to the enterprises. The contract is also now in use. Planning has changed. The plan and the market are combined as one. Using the economic, legal, and other measures at its disposal, the state regulates the market and the supply and demand within it, while the market, in its turn, guides enterprises as to what they should produce and in what quantities.

An integral part of the reform is the new supply system. Thanks to this system, the transition has been made from the centralized distribution of raw materials and semimanufactures to trade in them. Centers and wholesale markets where people can buy and sell means of production and resources have been created for this purpose. Prices at these markets are at three levels: state prices, floating prices, and contractual prices. Only materials in very short supply are now allocated on a quota basis—the rest must be obtained at the markets.

The election of enterprise directors, the issue of shares, the formation of joint, joint-stock, and private (the hire of 3 or more workers is permitted) enterprises, and the merging of enterprises (not an administrative measure, but a purely economic one) to avoid bankruptcy—the reform has brought all this with it.

And, finally, "kaifang," which means "openness." It signifies an open policy: on the one hand, within China itself (the removal of various departmental and territorial barriers) and, on the other, a policy of attracting foreign capital, the latest technology, and the most up-to-date equipment and creating special economic zones, mainly in coastal regions. Four such zones have been opened: 14 cities and ports and also the whole of Hainan Province.

A visitor's pass to a special economic zone—the ultramodern city of Zhuhai. Ten years ago it was a mediocre provincial center whose inhabitants lived by farming and fishing. Now there are more than a dozen different enterprises here, including those which produce electronic equipment, television sets, radio-cassette recorders, computer programs, and freezers. A total of 3.4 billion yuan have already been invested in the city's development, as well as $700 million of the $2 billion of planned foreign capital (mainly put up by the United States, Japan, Singapore, Hong Kong, and Belgium). Some 500 joint enterprises are in operation and 30,000 units of modern equipment have been leased.

Last year Zhuhai's gross output amounted to 2 billion yuan, which means a 10-fold increase in comparison to 1979. Exports have increased 60-fold and now stand at $360 million.

"The party's Central Committee," Yu Binglin, member of the Standing Committee and head of the Zhuhai CPC Municipal Committee Propaganda Department, said, "has set our economic zone two basic tasks: to help attract foreign capital and to promote the greatest possible spread of modern equipment and technology."

We returned to Beijing toward evening. We were due to fly home in the morning. We leafed through our notes and exchanged our impressions. But how were we to express all we had seen and heard? We must not forget to point out that, despite all the appreciable changes in people's lives, the country still has a poor standard of living at present. The gross national product is still not very high. There is a shortage of housing and other facilities that go to make up the social infrastructure. There are problems with developing public transport.

In expressing your first impressions on becoming acquainted with this country it is sometimes hard to refrain from a certain degree of idealization, although, observing the realities of China, you do, of course, realize that the ordinary people do not have easy lives. However, the course taken and the changes begun are irreversible.

PRC's Zhao Cited on Party Work Priorities

PM3101112789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jan 89 First Edition p 6

[TASS report: "For the Purity of Party Ranks"]

[Text] Beijing, 29 Jan—In order to improve the effectiveness of party building, it is necessary to work comprehensively for the absolute purity of party ranks and cohesion within the party, and to increase its attractiveness. This was stated by Zhao Ziyang, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, at an all-China working conference on the verification of party discipline held here.

The Chinese leader stressed that during the 10 years' implementation of reform under the party's leadership the country has achieved considerable success. It has been shown that the course pursued by the CPC is correct. Its work is becoming increasingly creative in character. Party organizations at all levels are marked by militancy. The overwhelming majority of party members are working determinedly for the good of the people. However, Zhao Ziyang pointed out, elements of disintegration and laxity persist within the CPC.

The speaker urged party committees to give priority to political and ideological work, which he called the key to the improvement of performance.

PRC Agriculture Minister Cited on Fishing Talks

PM3101154989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jan 89 Second Edition p 5

[Report from PRAVDA-TASS-REUTER roundup dated 27 November under the rubric "From the Stream of News": "First Session"]

[Text] The first session of the Soviet-Chinese Commission on Cooperation in the Sphere of Fishing has been held in Beijing. The results of this commission's work should be evaluated positively—PRC Agriculture Minister He Kang voiced this opinion, emphasizing that the first interdepartmental commission in the history of Soviet-Chinese business relations is called upon to resolve important questions concerning the development of mutually advantageous cooperation in realizing the food programs in each of the two countries.

Northeast Asia

Gerasimov Urges Improvement in Japanese Relations

PM3101113989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 4

[G. Charodeyev report under the "At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center" rubric: "In Search of Effective Policy"]

[Text] The coauthors of the book "Unfolding Opportunities: From the 'Cold War' To Peaceful Rivalry and Cooperation In Soviet-U.S. Relations"—G. Arbatov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences U.S. and Canada Institute; G. Allison, dean of Harvard University's John Kennedy School of Management and Business; and also W. Ury, a scientist from the same university—spoke to Soviet and foreign journalists at a routine briefing.

This is a study that is the fruit of 6 years' work. Its main conclusion is an overall concept for the development of Soviet-U.S. relations that presupposes coexistence under conditions of peaceful rivalry and ever-increasing cooperation. It is a question of implementing the principles of the nonuse or threat of force while reducing and restructuring armed forces, both on the basis of unilateral initiatives and also bilateral and multilateral relations. The book's authors stress the need to continue consultations aimed at resolving regional conflicts. It is also necessary to broaden the functions of the Nuclear Risk Reduction Centers and elaborate further agreements following the example of the agreement on incidents at sea, under which representatives of the two countries' naval forces meet regularly to discuss how to avoid dangerous incidents.

G.I. Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, who moderated the briefing, then said:

"People in the Soviet Union have noted the Japanese leadership's positive reaction to the upcoming reduction in the Soviet Armed Forces in the east of the USSR by 200,000 men.

However, the Japanese Government's practical steps can hardly be described as being in line with the spirit and essence of the USSR's unilateral reduction on the Asian salient. We mean the decision adopted by Japan's cabinet to increase the country's military expenditure by almost 6 percent in fiscal 1989, using the traditional pretext of the 'Soviet military threat.' The decision to increase the military budget, particularly backed up by the argument of the 'Soviet threat,' adopted on the eve of the Soviet troop reduction in Asia, is hardly a factor that could promote an improvement in Soviet-Japanese relations. The need for such an improvement, incidentally, was noted during E.A. Shevardnadze's recent visit to Japan. The buildup of Japanese military might cannot help to strengthen security and trust in relations among countries of the Asia-Pacific region," G.I. Gerasimov stressed.

Japanese Reactions to Disarmament Initiative Noted

OW0102045989 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 26 Jan 89

[Gavrilov commentary; from "The World Today" program]

[Text] Dear listeners, political circles in the Asia-Pacific region are widely discussing the recent Soviet decision to reduce 200,000 of its ground and naval troops stationed in the eastern part of the Soviet Union and to withdraw 75 percent of its troops, including all of the air force units, from Mongolia. Our station commentator Gavrilov has the following comments:

The Chinese Foreign Ministry and officials of other countries in the Asia-Pacific region expressed satisfaction with Moscow's decision. Japanese Prime Minister Takeshita spoke positively of the Soviet decision. In response to a question raised by a reporter, the prime minister said: I believe this a very good decision. The new step taken by the Soviet Union was regarded in Asia as a timely move. It was viewed as a development of the Soviet proposals made in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk to improve the situation in the Asia-Pacific region.

Everyone knows that reducing tension, cutting down troops and arms, and correspondingly making the military strategies more defense-oriented are the key ways to improve the situation in the region. The Soviet Union acted along this line for many years in the past. It exercised restraint in military training, limiting the number of personnel and the area of training. This is still true

today. SHIJIE ZHISHI [World Knowledge], a Chinese journal, has pointed out the defensive nature of the Soviet military strategy and the decreasing activities of the Soviet Pacific Fleet.

There are, however, people who tried to vilify the Soviet peace-loving policy. A few days ago the Japanese Defense Agency played precisely such an inglorious part. According to a KYODO report, the Japanese military officials do not agree with Prime Minister Takeshita's positive assessment of the Soviet decision to reduce its ground and naval troops in the Far East. How did they arrive at their conclusion? Frankly speaking, their arguments are untenable. There is nothing in their arguments except the groundless charge about Soviet military buildup and the suspicion they want to cast on the intention of the Soviet disarmament. KYODO pointed out: The spokesman of the Japanese military department is very cold to Moscow's peace measures. The reason for their cold response is easy to discern. Tokyo's military figures want to achieve faster militarization. They want to use military force to increase Japan's monopoly of capital and to make Japan a principal player in the Asia-Pacific region.

Japanese Defense Buildup Against Spirit of Times
OW3101203589 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 26 Jan 89

[Dmitriyev commentary]

[Text] The other day, the Japanese Government approved the proposed 1989 defense budget of Y3,919 billion. Radio Moscow's commentator Dmitriyev wrote the following comments:

Only 2 weeks ago, during a meeting with Sohyo [General Council of Trade Unions of Japan] and Rengo [Private Sector Trade Union Confederation] leaders, Prime Minister Takeshita said that the government would respect the spirit of the 1 percent of the GNP ceiling for defense expenditures. On that occasion, Prime Minister Takeshita said that he understood the concern of Asian countries regarding increases in Japanese defense spending. Such remarks were also heard outside Japan. However, at present, if we consider the fact that nearly 4 trillion yen, which exceeds the 1 percent of the GNP ceiling, would afterall be appropriated for the new defense budget, we can make a new assessment of Prime Minister Takeshita's remarks. More so if we also take into consideration that the proposed 5.9 percent increase in the defense budget is the highest for the past 3 years.

Such an increase in defense expenditures in the light of recent favorable trends in the international situation is believed to contradict the spirit of the times. For instance, Soviet leader General Secretary Gorbachev announced a unilateral reduction of Soviet forces by 500,000 in his speech at the United Nations on 7 December 1988. During his talks with representatives of the Trilateral Commission, including former Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone, he also annnounced a force reduction of 200,000 in the eastern part of the Soviet Union. Soviet military presence in Mongolia will be cut by 75 percent, the Soviet military budget by 14.2 percent, and arms production by 19.5 percent. These decisions on the part of the USSR should form no new basis for a more rapid military buildup than before for its neighboring countries.

Nevertheless, Japanese official circles have not dropped their thesis of using the Soviet military threat to justify the increase in the defense budget. Recently, the Japanese Foreign Ministry stated that the so-called Soviet threat against Japan would not disappear even after Soviet force reduction. The statement was based on forrmer Prime Minister Nakasone's impression of his recent talks with General Secretary Gorbachev. Both former Prime Minister Nakasone and the Japanese Foreign Ministry, following his steps, believe that the 200,000 force reduction in Eastern USSR has nothing to do with the Soviet Far East, which is closest to Japan, and the Soviet Navy in the Far East.

What is the USSR's real intention? In his explanation on this issue, the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman clearly stated that the concept of Eastern USSR includes the Soviet Far East. Furthermore, according to a statement made by the chief of staff of the Far Eastern Military Region to a radio reporter the other day, a radical force reduction will also occur in the Far Eastern Military Region. This military region covers the east of Lake Baykal to Sakhalin, including large areas neighboring Japan.

As to the Navy, during his talks with former Prime Minister Nakasone, General Secretary Gorbachev stressed that the USSR would retrench the Army and the Navy in Eastern Soviet Union. Moreover, during 1984 to 1988, the Soviet Pacific fleet has reduced its force by 57 ships.

Under such conditions, the accelerated increase in defense expenditures on the part of Japan would not be within the definition of indispensable defense, but rather a manifestation of ambitions to become a military power. The Japanese military budget is expanding at a pace much faster than those of NATO countries. According to the computation method adopted by NATO, the Japanese defense budget has become the third largest in the world, coming after the USSR and the United States. There is a need to talk in more detail, on another occasion, about the Japanese Government's intention—but whatever that is, we can confidently conclude that the thesis on the so-called Soviet threat is nothing but an excuse. Recent reasoning on the part of Japan is particularly incomprehensible. We are of the impression that even if the USSR moved to another planet, the Japanese Government would continue to claim that the situation has not changed and that the Soviet threat remains.

From the above, we cannot but doubt that the Japanese official circles truly desire a relaxation of military tension in the Far East. If they really do, the Japanese leadership would not have overlooked even one of the great number of opportunies to promote this process offered by the recent developments.

The upcoming reduction of Soviet forces in Asia, plus the signing of the Soviet-U.S. INF Treaty, which also covers those deployed by the USSR in the Asian region, and the sharp cutback in the activities of the Soviet Pacific Fleet have not brought any changes in the scale and anti-Soviet tendency of Japanese armament. Regrettably, the proposals for promoting international security through political means made by General Secretary Gorbachev in Valdivostok in 1986 and in Krasnoyarsk last year were ignored.

However, if we really desire relaxation of tension, conditions for that process should be created. Needless to say, the unprecedented expansion of the Japanese defense budget during the present period of overall relaxation of tension in the international situation cannot be counted as one of the conditions. As it stands, relaxation of tension in the Far East is already difficult due to the concentrated military presence of the United States along the Soviet coast. What more with Japan adding to the problem?

On 23 January, ASAHI SHIMBUN carried an editorial: "Not a Time for Arms Buildup." The editorial pointed out that Japanese policies clash with the present trend toward disarmament. In reality, how long will the Japanese Government continue to ignore what is happening in the world? Despite the fact that the Eastern and Western camps have successfully completed preparations for negotiations on European disarmament in Vienna, the situation has not changed in the Far East. Are not the present Japanese policies forming an obstacle to improving the atmosphere in the region?

Japanese Socialists Criticize Military Increase

OW0102002189 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 26 Jan 89

[Text] The Moscow Radio correspondent in Tokyo, Potapov, reports on the recently held 54th Congress of the Japan Socialist Party as follows:

In the congress held at Japan Education Hall in Tokyo for 3 days from 23 to 25 January, deputies to the congress reviewed party activities in 1988 and adopted a party activity plan for this year. The party activity plan adopted at the congress reflects the great concern of the JSP members about policies carried out by the conservative government.

The party congress took note of the fact that the Japanese Government is pursuing a policy of reverting Japan to a military power. This policy is increasing the tension in Asia and is inviting criticism from other nations in the region.

The deputies to the JSP 54th Congress criticized the fiscal 1989 draft budget prepared by the government. The draft budget schemes to further expand military facilities at the expense of social welfare.

Papers submitted by the deputies to the congress stressed that party activities must be directed toward defending the democratic right of workers, strengthening peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region, preserving three nonnuclear principles, and maintaining the military spending within the limit of one percent of the gross national product.

The JSP in the congress expressed its determination to confront the ruling party in the forthcoming Diet election this summer and to lead a public campaign to protest unpopular tax reforms. The party also demanded thorough investigations on the Recruit Company insider trading scandal. Many influental leaders of the LDP are involved in the scandal.

JSP Chairperson Takako Doi, in a press conference following the congress, said that the most important task facing her is to unify efforts of the opposition camp and to expand the popular support for the JSP.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Supreme Soviet Group's Philippines Visit Noted

PM3101133989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 4

["On the Visit of the USSR Supreme Soviet Delegation to the Philippines"—IZVESTIYA headline; for further reports see the Soviet Union DAILY REPORT for 17 January, pp 19-20, 18 January, p 28, and 25 January, p 24]

[Text] At the invitation of the Congress of the Republic of the Philippines a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by V.V. Tereshkova, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, visited the Philippines on an official return visit 14-21 January.

The delegation was received by the president, the vice president, the president of the Senate, and the speaker of the House of Representatives. Members of the delegation met with the foreign minister, members of Congress, and ministers for science and technology, trade and industry, agriculture, and economic planning.

The Soviet parliamentarians laid a wreath at the monument to Jose Rizal.

Apart from Manila, the Soviet guests visited the three main regions of the Philippines—Luzon, the Central Visayan area, and Mindanao, where they acquainted themselves with the work of the local authorities and visited agricultural and industrial enterprises.

In the course of talks held in a warm and friendly atmosphere a thorough exchange of opinions took place on topical international problems and questions pertaining to the strengthening of bilateral ties.

The USSR Supreme Soviet deputies briefed Philippine representatives in detail on the current stage of the revolutionary changes taking place in all spheres of Soviet society's life on a basis of broad democratization, reform of the political system, and a switch to new principles of economic management, and also on the contribution being made by the soviets to the solution of these tasks.

In turn, the Philippine representatives briefed them on the measures adopted by their country's government under the leadership of President C. Aquino to ensure the economic and social development of the Philippines, and on their government's priorities and initiatives in the sphere of international relations.

The sides noted that on most of the international issues that were discussed there was a proximity or coincidence of positions. The parliamentarians noted with satisfaction that the new political thinking, which places universal human values and the creation of favorable conditions for the survival and progress of civilization in the forefront of world politics, will have a positive impact on international relations.

Soviet and Philippine parliamentarians, noting the favorable factors in the development of the international situation at present, stressed the great importance of the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, and expressed themselves in favor of the adoption of further measures in the disarmament sphere, specifically the early conclusion of an agreement on 50-percent cuts in strategic offensive arms. The two countries' representatives discussed regional problems and expressed the hope that speedy and peaceful solutions to these problems will be found.

During a discussion of the situation around Cambodia, the sides were unanimous in the view that the unblocking of this regional conflict calls for a stepping up of sincere and constructive efforts on the part of all the interested parties. It was noted that an important role in settling the Cambodian problem is being played by the dialogue between the Indochina states and ASEAN countries, and also by the Cambodian sides' representatives.

Attention was drawn to the importance of a joint quest by the entire international community for ways of resolving complex ecological problems and overcoming backwardness, poverty, and disease across vast areas of the planet. The link between disarmament and development and the need for a fair solution of the developing countries' foreign debt problem were stressed in particular.

The situation in the Asia-Pacific region was subjected to an in-depth analysis, bearing in mind its military, political, and economic aspects. Noting the increasing role of the Asia-Pacific Region in international affairs and within the system of international economic ties, the Soviet and Philippine representatives agreed that a lowering of the level of military confrontation and improvement of bilateral relations among the states of the area, irrespective of their sociopolitical orientation, would make a weighty contribution to the general process of improvement in the world situation.

The USSR Supreme Soviet deputies declared their support for plans to create a zone of peace, freedom, and neutrality in Southeast Asia.

The sides expressed satisfaction with the state of Soviet-Philippine relations, which are based on principles of noninterference in each other's internal affairs, equality, and mutual respect. They believe that it is essential to continue to develop and expand these ties on a systematic basis, and to consolidate everything good and positive that has already been achieved.

The great positive impact on the whole range of USSR-Philippines relations of the recent visit to Manila by E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, was noted. The representatives of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Philippine Congress affirmed their desire to contribute to the expansion and development of Soviet-Philippine partnership and cooperation, outlined in the joint statement of the two countries' foreign ministers. Confidence was expressed that the upcoming visits to the USSR this year of President C. Aquino, Secretary of Foreign Affairs R. Manglapus, and other Philippine leaders will give a new impetus to this cooperation.

It was emphasized that it is necessary to develop more dynamic trade and economic relations between the two countries through the identification and utilization of new spheres and forms of cooperation in this sphere. To this end a common desire was expressed to facilitate exchanges in the sphere of agriculture, industry, trade, science, technology, culture, sport, and tourism, with a view to strengthening mutual understanding and friendship between the two countries' peoples.

The importance was noted of further exchanges between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Philippine Congress, which constitute an important component of Philippine-Soviet relations and also of regular Soviet-Philippine parliamentary consultations on key international and bilateral problems. The two countries' parliamentarians assessed the current visit as a useful step which strengthened mutual understanding and friendship between the USSR and the Philippines.

The Soviet side expressed sincere gratitute for the hospitality and warm welcome extended to the delegation during its stay in the Philippines.

Australian Minister's Manila Visit Discussed
HK3101082589 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] Australian Foreign Minister Gareth Evans has visited the Philippines. Our observer, Anatoliy Aleksandrov, reports:

One of the principal questions discussed during the talks was economic cooperation. Canberra and Manila have long since established trade relations, and Australia has invested in various projects in the archipelago. There are joint ventures in various businesses, and annual trade totals $300 million. The visit by Mr Evans is aimed at further improving economic cooperation, but the Philippines is concerned that this will be one-sided, for it has registered a big deficit with its Australian partner.

Australia is one of the nations taking part in the mini-Marshall plan for the Philippines. President Corazon Aquino and Gareth Evans took up this issue in their talks. It was the United States that initiated this aid program. The Philippines is badly in need of assistance, for the country's external debts exceed $28 billion. Most observers believe that this is linked to several issues. It is clear that the United States would like to maintain its two big bases in the territory even after their expiration in 1991. This has been indicated by the Pentagon, for it wishes to modernize the bases.

What does this have to do with Canberra? Even before, participants in the aid program have favored the retention of the U.S. military bases in the Philippines. Australia has also extended for 10 years the leases of the two U.S. bases on its territory, which function as spying centers. U.S. research facilities are also situated in Australia.

The fate of the U.S. bases in the Philippines was discussed during the talks with Mr Gareth Evans. While nothing has changed, Australia is interested in issues regarding the Philippine nuclear-free policy. Canberra favors the setting up of nuclear-free zones. In fact, it has entered into an agreement declaring part of the South Pacific a nuclear-free zone. This is in accordance with the Philippine Constitution's antinuclear laws and ASEAN policies. The Philippine House of Representatives has just approved a draft antinuclear law, and the Australian minister took note of this development. These issues are being discussed not only by the public, but by government legislators as well.

The Australian foreign minister will also visit other Asian countries, where he will discuss matters involving the Asia-Pacific region's security. These developments show that countries in the Pacific wish to extend their regional cooperation by seeking a solution to human rights abuses.

Thai-Indochinese Trade Prospects 'Promising'
BK0102052489 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1230 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Vasiliy Fedorov commentary]

[Text] It was hardly cause for apprehension. Our impression is that the whole of Southeast Asia remains in the spotlight of a promising situation, as exemplified by the just-concluded visit of Comrade Hun Sen, chairman of the PRK Council of Ministers, to Thailand. The Indonesian paper MERDEKA likened the effect of the visit to that of a timebomb, but the comparison did not mean anything harmful at all. As a matter of fact, the visit has undoubtedly brought about significantly praiseworthy results. This is the viewpoint expressed by our commentator Comrade Vasiliy Fedorov.

The visit and its results were unimaginable earlier. Today we would like draw the listeners' attention to the importance of Comrade Hun Sen's visit, which seems to have been ignored by political observers in Asia. His visit to Bangkok was to improve trade and economic relations between Thailand and the PRK.

In the third quarter of last year, following his appointment as Thailand's prime minister, Chatchai Chunhawan, in a conspicuously commendable statement, said that he wished to transform Indochina from a battlefield into a marketplace. By extension, the word "trade" connotes not only commercial activity but also peaceful coexistence and cooperation between Thailand and its neighboring Indochinese countries in general.

As for Thai relations with Laos, the policy launched by Chatchai Chunhawan bore fruit by the end of last year. The two countries agreed on the elimination of stumbling blocks to expanding trade relations on the basis of mutual interests.

In January, the head of the Thai Foreign Ministry went to Vietnam. This was the first visit in 14 years. In addition to significant agreement on political issues, agreement on the promotion of trade and economic relations on the basis of mutual interests was also concluded.

For Cambodia, in the talks with Comrade Hun Sen, Chatchai Chunhawan reaffirmed his intention to turn Indochina from a battlefield into a marketplace, and provided the opportunity for prominent Thai businessmen to meet with the comrade PRK chairman. As mentioned in the joint statement, the two government leaders agreed to open up the prospects for expansion of bilateral trade relations. They also earnestly concurred on the establishment of a joint committee to explore possibilities for Thai investment in Cambodia. The two sides considered fishery, tourism, gem mining, and a project of using the Mekong River as a source of energy as the most promising fields for their trade and economic

ventures. And the thing worth recalling was that Chatchai Chunhawan expressed his intention to declare at the earliest possible moment a policy of free trade relations with the Indochinese states, abandoning useless political and economic obstacles.

Near East & South Asia

Relations With Israel To Resume 'Within 3 Months'

JN0102155089 Kuwait AL-RA'Y AL-'AMM in Arabic 31 Jan 89 p 1

[Text] Tunis—Leading Palestinian sources have informed AL-RA'Y AL-'AMM that the Soviet Union recently informed Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad and PLO Chief Yasir 'Arafat that it will resume diplomatic relations with Israel within the next 3 months. The Palestinian sources added that the Soviet Union rejected Syrian and PLO pressures to freeze relations with Israel and to exert increased political pressure on Israel in coordination with the United States.

The Palestinian sources said that Moscow's communication of this intention to Damascus and the PLO is in line with information from other sources on the Soviet Union's intention to achieve rapprochement with Israel.

The sources said that there are signs that Moscow intends to turn the Israeli consular delegation into a permament diplomatic mission in the near future.

The Soviets recently met an Israeli request to transfer the consular delegation to the Israeli Embassy headquarters in Moscow.

General Gromov Says Afghan Withdrawal On Target

LD3101181589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1721 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] Kabul, 31 Jan (TASS)—In accordance with the Soviet leadership's political decision, the limited contingent of Soviet troops in the Republic of Afghanistan will leave that country, right to the last soldier, within the time limits defined by the Geneva Accords. This is what Lieutenant General B.V. Gromov, commander of the limited contingent of Soviet troops, said today at a press conference in Kabul for local and foreign journalists. He stressed that the Soviet and Afghan sides have been scrupulously observing all the provisions of the Geneva accords package while Pakistan and the United States, who are guarantors of the accords, have been openly and crudely violating them.

Soviet troops, the general said, came to the aid of the Afghan people at a difficult moment, at the request of the legitimate government of that country. Now our soldiers and officers are leaving with a sense of duty fulfilled, leaving the people of Afghanistan with hundreds of schools which have been built or repaired, public buildings and mosques, and hundreds of kilometers of roads and irrigation ditches. The value of the military towns with their living quarters and services and their communal buildings handed over to the Afghan side is estimated at over R660 million.

Combat friendship has grown up and strengthened between Soviet and Afghan soldiers, and the combat readiness of the Afghan army has risen immeasurably. The opposition, on the other hand, ignores the basic interests of the population and in its actions tramples on the moral norms shared by mankind. It is trying to blockade major towns, including Kabul, thus condemning children, old people, and women to death from starvation. Gromov explained in this connection that the effective blow struck recently by the Afghan Army, with the assistance of Soviet units, against the armed formations of Ahmad Shah Mas'ud, which were trying to cut the road between Hayraton [name as received] and Kabul, south of Salang, was undertaken precisely with the aim of ensuring the normal supply of all necessities to the capital and to its inhabitants. The Afghan army now controls [kontrolirovat] the situation to the south of Salang and is ready to oppose attempts by the armed opposition to cut the "road of life".

In conclusion, confidence was expressed that the Afghan Army has every possibility of giving a worthy rebuff to the intrigues of the opposition.

Afghan Rebels Blow Up Kabul Shopping Center

LD0102173889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1645 GMT 1 Feb 89

[Text] Kabul, 1 Feb (TASS)—Two terrorist acts were committed today by extremists in the Afghan capital. There were powerful explosions in the building of the state transport company "Mili Bus" and in the "Jamhuriat" shopping center situated right next to it.

The explosions caused serious damage to residential and administrative buildings. Fortunately no citizens were hurt.

Writers Group Chairman Discusses Afghan Prospects

PM3001140589 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 27 Jan 89 p 3

[Interview with Abdula Naibi [name as transliterated], deputy chairman of Afghan Writers' Association, by M. Yusin: "Time To Make Adjustments"; date and place of interview not given; first paragraph is SELSKAYA ZHIZN introduction]

[Text] Now that, according to the Geneva agreements, only a few days remain until the completion of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, there are many letters in the editorial mailbag asking: "How will events around Afghanistan and in the republic itself develop in the future? What do the Afghans themselves think about this?" At SELSKAYA ZHIZN's request, M. Yusin, journalist and specialist on international affairs,

met with Abdula Naibi, deputy chairman of the Afghan Writers' Association, and asked him to express his opinion on the questions encountered most frequently in the letters.

[Yusin] The situation in Afghanistan is extremely strained. Every day the newspapers carry reports of new battles, bombardments, and bomb blasts. Are there grounds for supposing that the tension will begin to decrease in the coming months?

[Naibi] Rather the reverse. The opposition is making no secret of its plans: Straight after the withdrawal of Soviet forces, mujahidin detachments are preparing to mount a resolute offensive against the people's power. The flame of conflict will flare up with new force. The war will obviously come to the cities, where counterrevolutionary agents are already preparing the ground to seize power. Our leadership must not delude itself: It will hardly be possible to bring about reconciliation with the totally uncompromising opposition leaders. We must prepare for a fierce struggle.

[Yusin] You say that such a struggle is inevitable. Can it be concluded that the policy of national reconciliation conducted by the government was not worthwhile?

[Naibi] I think that it is time to make amendments to this slogan. National reconciliation—yes, but from a position of strength. In continuing the search for ways to a peaceful settlement, the people's power must not forget for a moment the need to strengthen the ranks of its own supporters.

[Yusin] How do you see this being done?

[Naibi] "Cosmetic" measures alone are insufficient. In order to change in our favor the correlation of forces within the country, a radical restructuring of the political system is needed. I can judge this not only as a writer, but as a PDPA member who is on the Central Committee.

In my view, it is necessary to begin with the party, changing its status and maybe also its name. A broad organization should be created, for example, a "Progressive Movement of Afghanistan" (the name, of course, is hypothetical). Everyone who advocates social progress must be drawn into its ranks—Communists, socialists, democrats, and representatives of left-wing Muslim movements. Some prominent government figures, not necessarily Communists, should head the organization.

What is the point of all these changes? Above all, a united front of left-wing forces in the struggle against reaction will be created.

In my view, such changes would make it possible to boost the prestige of people's power among the population. The only pity is that there is very little time left for their implementation—a matter of weeks.

[Yusin] How does the intelligentsia feel?

[Naibi] Most members of it are on the side of the people's power. I, of course, am by no means idealizing the government and the PDPA—there were serious mistakes in their activity, some party workers sullied themselves with corruption, and a suicidal factional struggle seethed for many years. All that is true.

But for all its shortcomings, the PDPA remains one of the few influential political organizations in our region to oppose the the Islamic fundamentalists' medieval fanaticism. While it is still possible to mobilize illiterate peasants with religious slogans and calls to join the ranks of "fighters for the faith," the intelligentsia understands better than anyone what the detachments of Hekmatyar, Rabbani, and the Shi'ite "Eight" entrenched in Iran have in store for Afghanistan. If these people seize power, the country will be set back in its development for decades and will be plunged into medieval chaos. Words like "democracy," "freedom," and "culture" will become historical terms. It is not for nothing that Hekmatyar's gangs are already killing teachers and destroying schools in the cities and villages they have seized.

[Yusin] But the opposition is heterogeneous. Besides extremists like Hekmatyar, there are also more moderate figures....

[Naibi] I think that there can be no moderates or center in our country today. Now only the left-wing camp—the union of progressive forces—and the right-wing camp—the armed opposition—exist. If some of the leaders of the "Peshawar seven" are posing as liberals, this is only being done so as not to put off Western public opinion. The opposition ringleaders are interested in assistance from Washington and its allies. And to ensure that the Americans for a while do not realize whom they are financing, they have to make themselves out to be "moderates." But once these people have gained a foothold in Kabul, the mask will be dropped: They will set up in Afghanistan a bloody, despotic regime permeated with the spirit of religious fanaticism and intolerance.

[Yusin] Will the accession to power of Benazir Bhutto in neighboring Pakistan have an influence on the situation in your country?

[Naibi] No changes are to be expected. In order to become prime minister, Mrs Bhutto was forced to pledge to fulfill three conditions: to maintain the Army's dominant position in society, leave Ishaq Khan as president, and not change the country's policy regarding Afghanistan. So I think the opposition camps will remain as before on Pakistani territory, and U.S. military aid to the mujahidin will continue to be channeled via Pakistan.

[Yusin] What do you think—was the decision to bring Soviet troops into Afghanistan a mistake?

[Naibi] A difficult question if you look at it from the perspective of today's thinking. Back in 1979 everything was different. In the Soviet Union what you now describe as stagnation phenomena were at their zenith; on the other hand, U.S. expansionism was intensifying. It was another era then; politicians did not think in terms of compromises. The sharpened conflict between the two social systems materialized on Afghan soil.

Something else must also be mentioned. Today, when I look back at the past, I think: Could the Soviet forces have performed their tasks within a year or two, and by now have been long gone? I think this was possible. But this aim was not set. Neither Moscow nor Kabul thought that your soldiers would return swiftly. Gradually people stopped seeing the presence of the Soviet contingent in Afghanistan as a temporary, emergency measure. This did not, of course, help to unblock the situation.

Now that we have mentioned mistakes, I would like to touch on one more point. Why are there 5 million Afghan refugees in Pakistan and Iran, refugees whom the bandit formations so often recruit to swell their ranks? What made them leave their homes? Was it just mujahidin atrocities? Were our actions as regards these people always well founded and justified?

[Yusin] What contribution can the intelligentsia make to the process of consolidating Afghanistan's progressive forces?

[Naibi] A very significant one. And, frankly, it is regrettable that there are very few representatives of the intelligentsia among party and government leaders. They must be given a rostrum more often; they must be trusted more. They know their people well, they know how to speak with them and persuade them. Educated, cultured people must convey our policy to the masses. Today the intelligentsia is the ally of people's power. We should be bolder in relying on it.

Afghan Army's Highway Assignment 'Far From Easy'
PM0102100189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Feb 89 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Serious Trials Lie Ahead"]

[Text] Kabul, 31 Jan—It happened early in the morning on 23 January. The sound of artillery barrage broke the predawn silence all along the southern sector of the "lifeline highway" linking Kabul and Termez on the Soviet bank of the Amudarya River. Cannon and rocket artillery fire was targeted on areas adjoining the Hayraton-Salang Pass-Kabul highway.

What is Salang? It is a high mountain pass, where convoys carrying freight for the Afghan capital travel through a tunnel more than 3 km long to cross the mountain range on their way south, to Jabal os Saraj, Charikar, and on to Kabul.

The southern section of this most important strategic highway has been "straddled" by thugs under Ahmad Shah Mas'ud, one of the best known commanders of oppositionist formations in Afghanistan. His detachments have managed to dig in in the Panjsher Valley and along the southern section of the highway.

The Soviet command and the Afghan authorities have repeatedly approached Ahmad Shah Mas'ud with constructive proposals on cooperation. Specifically, he was even offered the responsibility of guaranteeing safety along the Charikar-Kabul highway. But this proposal, like several others, was turned down.

On 26 December last year the Main Command of the Republic of Afghanistan Armed Forces issued a declaration calling on Ahmad Shah Mas'ud and the commanders of combat groups under his orders to come to the negotiating table. In its desire to prevent attacks on food convoys traveling through the Salang Pass to Kabul, the Afghan Army Command issued an ultimatum to Mas'ud's group: If they refused to cooperate, force would be used against his formations. The population of villages located near this section of the highway was advised to leave the zone of possible combat operations. As a matter of fact, similar warnings were subsequently repeated on several occasions. Ahmad Shah Mas'ud failed to reply to this ultimatum.

Kabul's vulnerability from the viewpoint of supplies was graphically displayed in mid-January. Difficulties were created not only by adverse weather conditions at Salang and the sluggishness of Afghan government organs in failing to ensure the city's food supplies promptly, but also as a result of actions by Ahmad Shah Mas'ud's grouping, which recently destroyed around 100 and robbed over 500 private and state-owned motor vehicles. In these conditions, the Afghan Army Main Command deemed it necessary to use all the resources at its disposal to ensure normal supplies for the capital's population and put a stop to criminal activities by Mas'ud's formations.

The aim of fire strikes by the Afghan Army along the Salang Highway was not only to "open" it for freight convoys on their way to the capital but also to establish firm control over it following the departure of Soviet troops. This will be far from easy and will be a major test for the Afghan units which will be assigned the difficult duty of guarding the Hayraton-Kabul Highway.

Unions Request Help for Afghan Service Veterans
LD3101105589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] The withdrawal of our troops from Afghanistan is due to be completed on 15 February. The political tasks will, most likely, be dealt with very quickly. However, the moral problems will continue to trouble our minds for a long time. Each one of you can help the former troops to adapt socially more quickly and help them

build a life for themselves if you take part in the public action "Trade Unions for Internationalist Servicemen." This will take part throughout the entire country from 1-10 February. It is understood that the problems that have built up over the years will not be solved in 10 days, but it is simply essential to shout aloud once again the nature of the true situation of those who have been at the front.

Thousands of young men already back from Afghanistan have experienced themselves that despite the various resolutions regarding benefits—for instance, for receiving accommodation out of turn, holidays at any time, loans for construction, and much more—these resolutions are not fully carried out in almost all towns or rayons. The trade unions are doing a great deal to monitor their [the resolutions'] operation. The AUCCTU hopes that the problem of the internationalist servicemen will soon be taken off the agenda. Why then, you will ask, is this action needed? The point is that in the first 10 days of February, meetings with servicemen from Afghanistan, concerts, fairs, works of art and crafts, and sports contests will be organized and all the funds raised will go to build rehabilitation centers for internationalist servicemen. The public action will be concluded at the House of the Unions.

IZVESTIYA Interviews DFLP's Hawatimah

PM3101151489 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Nayif Hawatimah, general secretary of the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine, by M. Kozhevnikov in Moscow, under the rubric "Event: Nature and Opinions": "Nayif Hawatimah: A Clash of Views Is Better than a Show of Unanimity"; date of interview not stated; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] The Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (DFLP) is one of the main Palestinian organizations belonging to the PLO. This year the front marks its jubilee—the 20th anniversary of its formation.

Our correspondent met with Nayif Hawatimah, general secretary of the DFLP, who is in Moscow, and asked him to describe the present state of affairs in the Palestinian resistance movement and comment on recent events in the Near East.

[Kozhevnikov] You have just come back from Tunis, where PLO headquarters are located. What urgent problems now face the PLO leadership?

[Hawatimah] I will touch on just one of them, the most important, in my view. A working conference of leaders of the main organizations belonging to the PLO was held in Tunis 15-16 January. The central point on the agenda was the question of forming a provisional government of the independent Palestinian state. There was a fairly heated debate and the most diverse opinions, sometimes diametrically opposite, were expressed.

[Kozhevnikov] Forgive me, but is this not a case of "dividing up the bearskin before you've killed the bear"?

[Hawatimah] Indeed, from outside it could look as if we are arguing over which of us will take which post in a cabinet that does not yet exist. But that is not so. It is not a question of allocating ministerial portfolios, but of the principles of the formation of our government. For instance, we in the DFLP believe that the well-known decisions of the Algiers session of the Palestine National Council (PNC) set forth the correct platform, in political and class terms, for the formation of a government. We firmly believe that all groupings of the Palestinian resistance movement as well as independent Palestinian figures who adhere to the decisions of the Algiers session of the PNC should be represented on the government. Our opinion, which is also shared by some Fatah leaders, is that places should also be reserved in the future government for representatives of the united national leadership of the rising in the occupied territories.

And another important aspect. We believe that the PLO Executive Committee and Central Council are called upon to monitor the government's activity. It will thus be possible to avoid contradictions between the PLO leadership and the cabinet.

[Kozhevnikov] But as I understand it, different opinions exist on this?

[Hawatimah] Yes. For instance, Yasir 'Arafat has put forward a plan for the formation of a comparatively large government (27-30 people) in which the vast majority of places are assigned to so-called independent Palestinian figures. Let me explain that here we are talking about Palestinians from among the national haute bourgeoisie who live in the occupied territories and elsewhere. Representation of the main groupings of the Palestinian resistance movement on the cabinet is reduced to a minimum (only 7-8 places). In our view that is clearly insufficient and is contrary to the decisions of the Algiers session. We also have other criticisms of this plan, and therefore we expressed our disagreement with it. I must say that some people at the Tunis conference simply rejected discussion of the question of a future Palestinian government....

[Kozhevnikov] So there are new disagreements here?

[Hawatimah] It is quite natural for an open democratic debate on such an important matter to uncover different approaches. I think a clash of views is always better than a show of unanimity. We agreed that we will come back to the problem of the formation of a government in the second half of February. For the time being the question remains open.

[Kozhevnikov] At the end of last year there was, you could say, a sensational event—direct contacts between PLO and U.S. representatives began. There is still much discussion over this and conjectures of all kinds are being constructed. It would be interesting to hear your opinion.

[Hawatimah] I agree, it is indeed an extraordinary event. After long years of stubbornly refusing to recognize the PLO, the Americans were forced to commence dialogue with it in the end. This indisputably testifies to the PLO's prestige, which has grown as a result of the continuing uprising in the occupied territories, and especially since the Algiers PNC session. Washington seems to have realized that without involving the PLO in the settlement process you can hardly achieve any real results. But the Americans want to do this in their own way. In my view, having begun dialogue with the PLO, they are pursuing several objectives at once. Chief among them is that of securing an end to the Palestinians' uprising in the occupied territories.

At the working conference in Tunis that I mentioned, Y. 'Arafat informed us that Washington, through its West European allies, is stepping up the pressure on the PLO leadership to try and make it at least suspend the uprising. Let me also remind you of the recent proposal by Israeli Defense Minister Rabin on holding municipal elections in the occupied territories on condition that the uprising stop for a period of 3-6 months. In my view that is nothing but a tactical ruse by the Israelis, who are trying to gain at least a "respite" for themselves.

As for our position—the DFLP position—on this question, it is firm: While the occupation regime exists, the uprising should continue!

[Kozhevnikov] You said that the United States, in establishing contacts with the PLO, pursues other objectives too.

[Hawatimah] Quite true. The Americans, for instance, want the PLO's political and military structure to be reorganized. They demand that we "restructure ourselves according to the American scenario" and try to convince us that in its present form the PLO "cannot participate in the Near East settlement as an equal partner." In fact it is a question of the desire to split the organization and distort its democratic and political nature. We consider such demands absolutely unacceptable.

[Kozhevnikov] In the world press, and especially the Arab press, the question of the persisting disagremeents between the PLO and Syria is still discussed. Are there grounds for such reports?

[Hawatimah] Yes, unfortunately. We have always been convinced that the strengthening of the PLO's ties with all the Arab states, including Syria, is vitally necessary to the entire Palestinian resistance movement. But the "special position" held for various reasons by Damascus and the right wing of the PLO makes it difficult to fulfill this important task. Nonetheless some positive signs have emerged recently, inspiring hopes for the normalization of Syrian-Palestinian relations. Thus Syria has agreed to participate in the planned pan-Arab summit conference, in which the PLO will also participate. The DFLP recently called for a dialogue between the PLO and the four "front-line" states—Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, and Jordan. We hope this appeal will meet with a positive response.

Polyakov, Arab Ambassadors Discuss Mideast Peace
JN0102102289 Amman AL-RA'Y in Arabic
1 Feb 89 pp 1, 16

[Text] Beirut— The Arab ambassadors in the USSR have said that Soviet officials are constantly interested in the Middle East crisis, and that Moscow expects important progress to take place, through contacts by Soviet officials with the U.S. Administration and the European countries, on holding the international Middle East peace conference shortly after the new U.S. Administration assumes its duties.

The Council of Arab Ambassadors met last week with Valdimir Polyakov, chief of the Near East and North African Countries Administration at the Soviet Foreign Ministry. Polyakov briefed the Council on the outcome of the international contacts underway on the Middle East crisis, particularly the outcome of the meetings held by the Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard Shevardnadze on the sidelines of the conference on banning chemical weapons held recently in Paris.

The Council of Arab Ambassadors asked Polyakov that the USSR exert stronger regional and international pressure on Israel to stop its repressive and terroristic actions against Palestinian citizens on the West Bank. The Council also requested that the USSR ask the United States to take the necessary measures to exert pressure on Israel to withdraw from southern Lebanon, leave the Lebanese alone, and stop interfering in their internal affairs.

Polyakov asserted that the USSR continues to support the Arab causes; foremost, the Palestine question. He said the USSR is continuing its efforts with friendly countries to hold the international conference for peace in the Middle East, as it is the only means for peace in the region following the failure of bilateral talks and of the Camp David accords—despite the fact that 10 years have passed since the signing of these accords.

Polyakov said that the United States is not exerting the required pressure on Israel to achieve concrete progress on holding the international conference. He said Moscow noticed this during its contacts with the U.S. Administration. But this does not indicate a stalemate in the contacts. In fact, in the near future Soviet officials will intensify their contacts with President George

Bush's adminstration on the Middle East question. Polyakov said: Soviet officials hope that the contacts will achieve concrete progress toward the peace process in the Middle East, after Israel has found itself in a predicament because of the continuation of the Palestinian uprising, its inability to terminate it, and because of the growing international support for the Palestinian people's cause.

India's Gandhi Interviewed on Regional Relations

PM3101122389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Interview with R. Gandhi"]

[Text] Delhi, 26 Jan—"Our relations with the USSR are distinguished by the mutual desire to strengthen and broaden cooperation and mutual understanding. Both India and the Soviet Union firmly believe that in order to remove the threat of nuclear annihilation, we must work to create a nuclear-free, non-violent world," Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi said. In an interview with the Indian journal DEFENCE AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS, published in its latest issue, he stressed that India and the Soviet Union agree that there is now an urgent need to ensure the effective reduction of strategic nuclear weapons, conclude a treaty banning all nuclear tests, and develop an international convention outlawing the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

"M.S. Gorbachev recently paid his second visit to India. We are exceptionally satisfied with the results of the visit, which has given new impetus to our cooperation and mutual understanding," the prime minister noted.

Dwelling on Indian-Chinese relations, he stressed that all problems between the two countries must be solved through consultation. We feel it necessary to revive bilateral relations for the good of peace and stability in Asia. The present atmosphere is evidence that China is interested in developing friendly ties with India. As the Chinese government has emphasized, the improvement and development of these ties will not only benefit our two countries but will also contribute to strengthening stability and peace in the region and throughout the world.

The prime minister stressed that India is trying to have friendly, good-neighborly ties with Pakistan. The key to their improvement lies in faithfully implementing the Simla agreements, which aim to replace confrontation with cooperation. "I sincerely hope that the Pakistani authorities will refrain from giving support to terrorist and fundamentalist elements operating in India," R. Gandhi said.

East Europe

PRAVDA Reports Hungarian Troop Cut Decision

PM0102150189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Feb 89 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Government's Tasks"]

[Text] Budapest, 31 Jan—In addition to resolving tasks of economic stabilization, Hungary needs a new strategy designed to create real conditions for a breakthrough and resurgence in development. This must be the aim of the anti-inflation policy, the "opening of doors" to the world economy, and the orientation toward exports, Miklos Nemeth, member of the MSZMP Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers, declared when addressing a session of the Hungarian Economic Chamber Presidium.

He reported on the Hungarian Government's decision to reduce the strength of the Hungarian People's Army, as well as armaments and military hardware, by almost 9 percent in 1989-1990. This step, M. Nemeth said, has been taken at the suggestion of the Hungarian military leadership in the interests of ensuring that Hungary, too, makes its contribution to deepening the process of detente and to the success of the talks on conventional armed forces in Europe, which begin in March. On one hand, the adopted decision is a consequence of the development of international events, and on the other it is intended to promote a further improvement of the world atmosphere.

Hungarian Political Liberalization Viewed

PM3101174589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jan 89 Second Edition p 6

[Article by special correspondent A. Karpychev: "Hungary Familiar and Unfamiliar"]

[Text] Budapest, Moscow—I did not recognize Hungary this time, even though it was only 5 years since my last visit. It had changed. Not in outward appearance—but in the form of its discussions. They were clearly dominated by a mood of criticism. People told me about the rise in prices, about the eminent private entrepreneurs who have appeared on the social horizon, about democracy, which has aroused free thought, about the alternative groups, and much more that previously was not discussed at all.

But what if this were no more than talk... The day after my arrival in Budapest I saw the following words on a white cloth flapping in the wind near the Margaret Bridge: "Are you still living with your parents?" I asked: "What does that mean?" And it was calmly explained to me that the day before there had been a demonstration by young people here that recalled once again one of the most acute problems—housing. The young people had

brought their slogans: "We have the ideas but no apartments, you have the apartments but no ideas." The reproach was aimed at the government.

"Freedom and glasnost have driven everyone mad," one of my old acquaintances, an elderly man, noted. "But you will agree, freedom is needed not to beat one another with but to achieve a good life..."

As I tried to understand what was going on I could not help recalling the Hungary I had known some 10 years before when I was a correspondent there. It was my profound belief that at that time, too, it was trying to get away from dogmatic socialism. In 1968 they began an economic reform that cleared the way for market forces, which the Soviet press preferred not to mention: private cafes, vegetable stores, shoe repair and car repair workshops were permitted, and "bankrupt" restaurants were leased out. In elections here several candidates were nominated [for each deputy seat] and at the newsstands I myself bought church publications, for example, as well as party newspapers. To be frank, the Hungarians live better than we do, in my view. The food stores had everything; there were goods to suit all tastes, although everything has risen in price.

Nevertheless, the Hungarian national party conference in May 1988 put the question bluntly: either revolutionary renewal or a deepening of the crisis. The conference opted for renewal. New people entered the party leadership. Karoly Grosz, at that time chairman of the Council of Ministers, was elected general secretary and Imre Pozsgay, the economist Miklos Nemeth, and Rezso Nyers, whose name was hardly mentioned in the Soviet press even though he was one of the authors of the economic reform which had once displeased our leaders, became Politburo members. Nyers' return to the political scene was a surprise to many, although I believe this shows the great significance the party attaches to the new approaches to economic problems.

There is no question that the fresh winds of May roused society. They bore so much criticism on the wave of glasnost that within the party and society voices were heard to ask: Is a revolutionary breakthrough taking place in the country or is chaos reigning?

The question, clearly, resulted from the fact that the Communist Party itself was under critical fire. Western journalists, whose publications I have read, persistently voice the idea of the collapse of "party power" and even more persistently include in that "collapse" the idea of a multiparty system as the panacea. It even seemed to me that they view the political portraits of Hungary's leaders in terms of that idea.

I got to know many of the MSZMP's present leaders not from newspaper interviews. In the late seventies I often called on Karoly Grosz when he was chief of the Central Committee's Agitation and Propaganda Department. Then he worked as first secretary of a party regional committee and some time later returned to the capital. In Budapest this time I realized that the general secretary would be very busy and that there simply might not be any free time in his schedule, but nevertheless I did not lose hope of a meeting, even a brief one. Then I was told that Karoly Grosz would receive me at 0800 in the Central Committee building.

His large office seemed to be divided in two by a partition of carefully selected indoor plants. In one section, at the far end of the room, was a desk: Karoly Grosz stood up and came to meet us. The other part of the room had a round table in the middle clearly meant for visitors.

As the meeting was unofficial I ventured to ask a "private" question: "Is the burden of being general secretary a heavy one?" to which he quickly answered with a smile: "I do not know yet."

I noticed that among the topics we could have discussed he immediately highlighted the economy.

In his speeches, including one at the meeting of the Budapest party aktiv, he had said that there is less and less indifference in society and that the latter supports the complete removal of the vestiges and consequences of the Stalinist model of socialism. At the same time there are worrying phenomena—the radical character of certain methods, the threat of strikes, and the unwarranted demands.

From May to November he had temporarily retained the post of chairman of the Council of Ministers. Now the 40-year-old Miklos Nemeth has been appointed to that post.

"Now I will be able to focus all my efforts on work in the party," Karoly Grosz noted.

He is concerned at the criticism leveled at the party. The building of socialism in Hungary, in his opinion, is seen in the framework of the one-party system, whereas from the legal viewpoint the possibility of a multiparty system cannot be denied.

As for the question of power, the MSZMP advocates that various forces be involved in exercising it. In this respect, pluralism and diversity should serve the interests of socialism and not contradict them.

...I continued the discussion of the party and its role at the present difficult stage with Janos Berecz, member of the Politburo and secretary of the MSZMP Central Committee. I knew him, too; he had once headed the Central Committee's international department and afterward became chief editor of NEPSZABADSAG.

"Previously the party's leading role amounted to what the Central Committee said," Janos Berecz remarked. "What the Central Committee said, you did. There are

810,000 people in our party now. Some are leaving it. There is no reason to fear, I think. The MSZMP's policy should be conducted via party members. But to pursue a policy you need boldness, the boldness to assume responsibility for the future. Today we are placing the slogan of national cohesion on the agenda. And we must explain to people what democratic socialism is, what socialist pluralism is, what responsibility for the nation is. We want Central Committee members to attend party meetings in primary organizations more often. I attended such a meeting recently and heard the words: "It is a great honor for us to have you here." I replied: "I would have put it differently. It is a great honor for me to be here with you..." We are restructuring the Central Committee apparatus. The general secretary's commission will work mainly on domestic and foreign policy questions. There will be a number of other commissions: a party political commission, a socioeconomic commission, and a commission on social policy. They are not large, and include not only Central Committee members but prominent specialists, too.

The next two meetings—on the next day—were at the parliament. One was with Imre Pozsgay, member of the MSZMP Central Committee Politburo. At the time that I recall, he was minister of culture. The Western press calls him a most radical reformer. I told him about that assessment, and he replied: "That is their business."

"We in the Politburo are of the unanimous opinion that the political system needs reform. The system in which we lived gave scope for arbitrary decisions. The May party conference showed the road we must take. Yes, I agree, the party is going through a definite crisis because it did not adequately promote the process of change in society. In that context, two political questions arise. One is that the dictatorship of the leadership is being replaced by a democratic legal system plus a pluralism of opinions. The MSZMP's leading role consists not just in declarations and slogans. I do not think it necessary to enshrine words on the party's leading role in society in the Constitution. As for the creation of other parties, my opinion is that the multiparty system is inevitable; the question is one of timing. The MSZMP must prepare seriously for that. The second political question is: reform in the economic sphere. Reform is not a gift. We have no reserve other than the individuality of the worker, the individuality of the man who shows the way to efficient management. Therefore, the economic reform must be backed up by political measures."

I asked Imre Pozsgay about his attitude toward the alternative movements.

"There is no confidence in them within the party, in my opinion. But I see the danger of a political crisis not from the alternative groups. The problem will come if our institutions are unable to do anything. I do not believe, for example, that there are forces in our country who are thinking about restoration. We have achieved a certain living standard in Hungary, we are working to maintain it, and people have something to lose. In my view, this is a struggle of interests."

Both in the conversation with Janos Berecz and then with Imre Pozsgay I constantly wanted to ask: Before, when in the leading element of the party and state, had they foreseen those negative phenomena that are now being severely criticized?

"I saw a lot of that," Imre said. "And I got quite a few bruises in the process. But at the same time we created a certain critical base for evaluating the situation in the country. I once prepared a document entitled 'Turning point and reform.' I received a warning for it at the Politburo. But now its ideas have become the platform of our new actions. I am head of the commission studying the political experience of the post-liberation period and preparing a new party program."

I was taken from Imre Pozsgay's office straight to Maria Jakab, vice president of the National Assembly. I went along the quiet corridors of the parliament behind an officer of the guard, and for some reason found myself thinking that the words uttered here could never have been published in a newspaper but for the restructuring in our country. You will recall that at one time even the theme of subsidiary plots in Hungary was considered off-limits. Judging by our press, there were no difficulties or mistakes in the socialist countries—just peace and plenty.

This peace did not exist before, even less does it exist today, even in Maria's account of the new legislative acts the parliament is preparing.

"The right of assembly is one of the basic human rights," she said. "This was not in Hungary's laws before. We prepared a draft. The public—40,000-50,000 people—discussed it. I personally am glad that society added the principle of self-restraint to the discussion: in other words, that the demonstrations did not endanger the population, did not obstruct transport, and were not an action against the social system. That was said not at the top but at the bottom. I consider that a positive phenomenon. The laws we have adopted or are going to adopt are very important. But you cannot feed people with laws. We cannot conduct policy in such a way that we are constantly asking people to be more patient. The most important thing now, in my view, is to work harmoniously. When I meet with enterprise leaders I tell them: 'From the West we must import not Western democracy but Western discipline. We have something to learn there, too.'"

"In some sections of society there are calls to dissolve the parliament. It is claimed that it is not fulfilling its role at the present stage. What is your view on that?" I asked Maria.

"Dissolution is an extreme measure. In my opinion, the majority of deputies are meeting the requirements of the time. There is another factor here: It is that a man who accepts the laws should not stand aside from executing them and should be well aware of what people want."

These impressions of life in Hungary today would be incomplete if I said nothing about the so-called alternative groups. They are a reality of social life today, and the question of the attitude toward them was discussed at an MSZMP Central Committee plenum recently. The West is watching their formation particularly attentively. It sees these groups as the prototype of the future political parties that will compete with the MSZMP.

The organizers of my trip themselves suggested that I meet with some of them. This happened at the Patriotic People's Front building. The meeting was conducted by press department chief Laszlo Horvath. There were about 15 people gathered at a long table. There were television people there, too.

Laszlo Horvath asked the representatives of the alternative groups to give their names. I am not going to list their names here and now; there were a great many. I noted to myself that the people assembled were of different ages and, by all accounts, from different professions. Opposite me were sitting two elderly men who said they represented (to use their terminology) a party of small businessmen that was created in the early thirties and that had not subsequently been disbanded; these people, apparently, had automatically revived it. The names of other groups were mentioned: The Democratic Union of Science Workers, the "Glasnost" club, the Hungarian council of youth organizations, which, incidentally, includes the Hungarian Communist Youth League, the Hungarian Democratic Forum, the "Clear Winds" ["Yasnyye Vetry"] Society, the Pest Region Gypsies Society, and so forth.

It was an interesting discussion. During it I heard no talk about confrontation with the party and the government. Furthermore, when I asked the representatives of the small businessmen bluntly whether they are in opposition to the government or not, it seemed to me that my interlocutors even became angry. Of course, I was not a compatriot of theirs and there was a different degree of frankness involved here, it seemed.

What else can I say? The arguments used by the representative of the Hungarian Council of Youth Organizations struck me as curious. The basis for its creation was something on which all young people agreed: first, the burden of overcoming the crisis rests on young people's shoulders and, second, they are united by the idea that it was not they who created the crisis. As I understood it, this group is worried by the housing question and education problems. The Hungarian Democratic Forum has really had an impact. It publishes a journal called "TRUST." Its editor attended the meeting. The forum has gathered around itself representatives of the arts intelligentsia. "We support all initiatives that serve the interests of democracy whatever their origin," the editor said. "We do not want criticism of the party to produce a vacuum." At the same time, this organization does not consider the parliament's activity acceptable any more.

The next day the Hungarian newspapers carried a brief report on this meeting. I think that in so doing they wanted to show not so much its importance as the very fact that alternative groups are being recognized in the framework of the development of socialist democracy. Back in Moscow I received a report that one newspaper had carried a statement by the Social Democratic Party which, according to its leadership, had not been disbanded in 1956.

...It is difficult for me to evaluate certain facts of Hungarian life at the moment. One thing is clear: Society is on the move, and more and more people are joining in political life and casting off the cloak of the indifferent and aloof observer. For that reason, when people ask me "What has happened to Hungary?.." I reply: "Nothing has happened."

Sakharov Decries CSSR Crackdown, Soviet Support

AU3001123289 Paris AFP in English 1231 GMT 30 Jan 89

[text] Moscow, Jan 30 (AFP)—Soviet dissident Andrey Sakharov called on signatories of the Helsinki Final Act to condemn "repression against the democratic movement" in Czechoslovakia, in a statement released here on Monday.

Mr. Sakharov said that the "repression" was supported by the state-controlled media in the Soviet Union.

He described the action as an "evident breach" of accords made at the Vienna-based Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and called for the situation to be examined at the human rights follow up conference in Paris in May.

The statement was also signed by dissident magazine editor Lev Timofeyev, Mr. Sakharov's wife Yelena Bonner and Larissa Bogoraz, another member of Mr. Timofeyev's GLASNOST magazine.

The statement attacked the "dispersion by force of peaceful demonstrations, arrests, and threats of tougher repression made by the Czechoslovak authorities."

"The Soviet media, controlled by the state, show the democratic movement in Czechoslovakia in a lying way, supporting the repression being carried out," it added.

The 1975 Helsinki Final Act was signed by 35 nations—all of Europe except Albania with the United States and Canada—at the CSCE conference.

MPD Chief Lizichev Returns From Prague

PM3101155389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jan 89 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Arrival in Moscow"]

[Text] Prague, 26 Jan—Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, who was here on an official friendly visit at the invitation of Army General M. Vaclavik, CSSR minister of national defense, and Colonel General J. Klicha, chief of the Czechoslovak People's Army Main Political Directorate, departed from the CSSR today.

The Soviet guest and those accompanying him were seen off at the airport by Col Gen J. Klicha, chief of the Czechoslovak People's Army Main Political Directorate.

USSR Ambassador to the CSSR V.P. Lomakin was also among the sendoff party.

Army Gen A.D. Lizichev returned to Moscow on the same day.

He was met at the airport by Admiral of the Fleet A.D. Sorokin, first deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, and other officials.

Lieutenant General V. Pavlic, military and air attache at the CSSR Embassy in the USSR, was among the welcoming party.

Jaruzelski: Pluralism Must Not Imperil Stability

PM3101103589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jan 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "On Plenum's Results"]

[Text] Warsaw, 25 Jan—W. Jaruzelski's meeting with the workers of the Mazowiecki petrochemical and oil refining combine in Plock is evidence of Polish working people's great interest in the decisions of the PZPR Central Committee 10th Plenum.

Talking about the plenum decisions relating to trade union pluralism, the PZPR Central Committee first secretary stressed that pluralism must be accompanied by public order and the stability of the socialist state, which was created in a hard struggle and has just, inviolable borders. It is necessary to implement the reforms consistently. Any effort to paralyze, impede, or hinder this process deals a blow to working people and their life prospects, because only through the implementation of the economic reform will it be possible to get out of the difficulties.

In adopting the decisions on trade union pluralism, the PZPR Central Committee was acting on the basis of a profound belief in the wisdom of the Polish working class, the people's patriotism, and their responsibility, W. Jaruzelski noted.

Jaruzelski on Economic Reform, Democratization

PM0102151789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jan 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Common Aims. Jaruzelski Speech"]

[Text] Warsaw, 27 Jan—The PZPR Central Committee 10th Plenum decisions confirmed once again that the party has firmly adopted a policy of implementing an efficient reform of the economy while simultaneously preserving all the values of the socialist system, W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish State Council, emphasized. Speaking at a national conference of representatives of state enterprise labor collective self-management organs, he pointed out that the party and self-management have common aims on this issue. It is not easy to achieve them. We must not forget, for example, the consequences of the West's discriminatory economic measures against Poland.

The present changes in the country are deepening the democratization process and broadening the sphere of economic reforms, he went on to say. Democracy, pluralism, and self-management must serve to enable people to lead a better and worthier life and realize their material and spiritual needs more quickly, the Polish leader emphasized.

PRAVDA Outlines PZPR Reorganization Plans

PM3101143189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jan 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Reorganizing the Apparatus"]

[Text] Warsaw, 28 Jan—The Polish press has reported plans for a radical restructuring of the party apparatus both at the local level and in the PZPR Central Committee.

A number of voivodship committees are now approving new forms of work organization as an experiment. They amount in essence to the scrapping of PZPR voivodship committee departments while simultaneously setting up problem-solving commissions. The aim of such measures is to enhance the role played by elected party organs.

The changes, aimed at socializing party bodies, are continuing, Z. Czarzasty, secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, told TRYBUNA LUDU in an interview. The voivodship committees in, for example, Legnica, Koszalin, Elblag, Lublin, Lomza, and Slupsk are switching over to new forms of work. However, it is not intended to impose uniform organizational decisions from above on all party bodies.

Commenting on the PZPR Central Committee secretary's statement, TRYBUNA LUDU observes that the Central Committee is searching for organizational solutions that will enable the party apparatus to begin playing the role of a competent but ancillary link efficiently carrying out the decisions of PZPR elected organs.

Fifteen commissions, which will be functional, targeted, or topic-based in character, are being set up at present as part of the Central Committee reorganization. Full or candidate members of the Politburo, or Central Committee secretaries will head each of them. The commissions will also include Central Committee members and rank-and-file party members. Questions concerning the organization and personnel of the commissions will be finally decided at the 11th PZPR Central Committee Plenum. It is proposed that the number of political personnel in the PZPR Central Committee apparatus will be reduced by 45 percent.

CPSU's Medvedev Visits Romania, Meets Leaders

Leaves Moscow, Arrives in Bucharest

PM3101113189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jan 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "At the Invitation of the RCP Central Committee"]

[Text] V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, left Moscow for Bucharest 30 January on a working visit at the invitation of the RCP Central Committee.

He was seen off at the airport by V.M. Chebrikov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; A.Ya. Degtyarev, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department; R.P. Fedorov, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department; and other officials.

The send-off party included I. Bucur, Romanian ambassador to the USSR.

On the same day V.A. Medvedev arrived in Bucharest. The Soviet guest was met at the capital's Otopen airport by C. Olteanu, member of the Political Executive Committee and secretary of the RCP Central Committee, and other officials. The reception party included Ye.M. Tyazhelnikov, USSR ambassador to Romania.

Talks began at the RCP Central Committee between V.A. Medvedev and C. Olteanu. In the course of the talks the plan for ideological cooperation between the two fraternal parties for the 1989-1990 period is to be discussed.

Talks With Ceausescu, Olteanu

LD3101181289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1657 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] Bucharest, 31 Jan (TASS)—A meeting was held today between N. Ceausescu, general secretary of the RCP [Romanian Communist Party] and president of the SRR [Socialist Republic of Romania], and V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. During the conversation, which took place in a warm and comradely atmosphere, there was an exchange of views and information on questions of the development of the USSR and the SRR, Soviet-Romanian cooperation, and certain international problems.

Both sides stressed the need for active efforts toward developing the whole complex of ties between the two countries and parties. The desire was stressed for fuller use to be made of the potential of Soviet-Romanian cooperation in the spirit of the demands of the time and the urgent tasks of socialist construction. In this connection, the Soviet side described the present stage of restructuring and the renewal of society and provided information on the course of the radical economic reform and the reform of the political system.

During the conversation, much attention was focused on ideological cooperation between the CPSU and the RCP and on the further expansion of ties in this area. The importance was noted of discussing topical problems of social development on the basis of comprehensive analysis and generalization of accumulated experience, and of accelerating theoretical activity.

The belief was expressed that the present stage of development of the socialist countries requires the potential for their cooperation to be fully revealed, and new efforts to strengthen the positions of socialism and its prestige in the world.

The same day, a plan for ideological cooperation between the CPSU and the RCP for 1989-1990 was signed in Bucharest. The document was signed by V.A. Medvedev and K. Olteanu, member of the Political Executive Committee and secretary of the Central Committee RCP. The plan envisages the exchanging of work experience on topical questions of the theory and practice of socialism and joint efforts aimed at expanding and intensifying cooperation between party and public organizations, creative unions, and mass media bodies; and communication between work collectives and citizens of both countries. The creation of a bilateral commission on social sciences and measures aimed at activating ties between local party bodies are also envisaged.

During the working visit, V.A. Medvedev had talks with K. Olteanu on questions of ideological cooperation.

V.A. Medvedev visited the Academy of Sociopolitical Education at the RCP Central Committee and met its leadership, professors, and tutors.

Today, V.A. Medvedev, who has been in Bucharest on a working visit at the invitation of the RCP Central Committee, left for home.

He was seen off at the capital's Otopen Airport by K. Olteanu and other officials.

Comments on Talks

LD3101222989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 31 Jan 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; correspondent S. Zheleznyak report from Bucharest]

[Text] A meeting took place in Bucharest today between Nicolae Ceausescu, general secretary of the RCP and president of Romania, and Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev, member of the Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The need for active efforts in the development of the whole complex of relations between the two countries and parties was emphasized on both sides. Confidence was expressed that the present stage of the development of socialist countries requires the full exposure of the potential of their interaction and new efforts in strengthening the positions of socialism and its prestige in the world.

A plan of ideological cooperation between the CPSU and the RCP for 1989-90 was also signed in Bucharest today. The document was signed by Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Olteanu, member of the Political Executive Committee and secretary of the RCP Central Committee.

During the working visit, talks took place between Comrade Medvedev and Comrade Olteanu on questions of ideological cooperation.

[Begin Medvedev recording] The visit was, as you know, a very brief one. It lasted 1 day. But there was a lot in it, and the main result of it was the fact that we discussed and signed a plan of ideological cooperation between our two parties and countries for the next 2 years. This plan stipulates the level of economic [corrects himself] ideological cooperation we have attained, and advances it on certain issues.

We are in favor of—and we tried to reflect this in the document we have signed—our ideological ties becoming more diverse and including the whole spectrum of our relations, starting with cooperation in higher education, and the level of local party bodies, and ending with debate and joint discussion of topical theoretical problems.

We are in favor of intensifying contacts between labor collectives and collectives of scientific establishments, and of including as much as possible of the human factor—so to speak—in this process, and of our workers, agricultural workers, and scientists being able to meet more and discuss among themselves questions that interest them and to exchange experience.

I must say that this idea was probably the main one in today's meeting and conversation with Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu. [end recording]

Comrade Medvedev today left for Moscow.

Returns to Moscow

LD3101232389 Moscow TASS English 1914 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 31 TASS—Vadim Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, returned to Moscow today after a working visit to Bucharest at the invitation of the Romanian Communist Party Central Committee.

Katushev Meets With Romania's Andrei 25 January

PM3101120389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] A conversation took place 25 January between K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations, and S. Andrei, deputy prime minister of the Romanian Government.

GDR's Ott Ends Talks with Aboymov, Rogachev

LD0102093789 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1240 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—Two-day discussions between GDR Deputy Foreign Minister Harry Ott and Soviet deputy foreign ministers Ivan Aboymov and Igor Rogachev ended in Moscow today. Relations between the two countries and cooperation between the allied socialist states in maintaining security in Europe, the Asia-Pacific region, and the rest of the world were discussed in detail.

Zaykov Returns From SFRY, Met by Yakovlev

LD2901201589 Moscow TASS in English 1828 GMT 29 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 29 TASS—Lev Zaykov, Politburo member, CPSU Central Committee secretary, first secretary of the Moscow City Committee of the CPSU, has returned to Moscow today upon completion of his working visit to Yugoslavia.

At the airport he was met by Politburo member, CPSU Central Committee Secretary Aleksandr Yakovlev, and other officials.

Yugoslavia's Ambassador in the USSR Milan Veres was among the welcoming party.

SFRY Trade Unionists Arrive in Moscow

LD3101160789 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 2017 Gmt 30 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow, 30 Jan. (TANJUG)—A delegation of the Federation of Yugoslav Trade Unions, led by Marijan Orozen, president of the Council of Yugoslav Trade Unions, arrived in Moscow today for a visit to the Central Council of the Federation of Soviet Trade Unions.

The Yugoslav delegation started talks today with a delegation of the Central Council of the Federation of Soviet Trade Unions, led by Stepan Shalayev, chairman of the Soviet trade union organization. The members of the two delegations briefed one another on social developments in the two countries, and made reference to reciprocal information on the economy and the basic directions of the activity of Yugoslav and Soviet trade unions. Milan Veres, Yugoslav ambassador to the USSR, also took part in the talks.

The talks will be resumed after the Yugoslav trade union delegation returns from Leningrad, where it is travelling tonight for a briefing on the activity of Soviet trade union organizations.

Suvar Strictures at LCY CC Plenum Cited

PM0102124189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jan 89 Second Edition p 4

[Correspondent Ye. Fadeyev dispatch: "LCY Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Belgrade, 30 Jan—The 20th LCY Central Committee Plenum began its work here today. The current political situation in the country, relations within the LCY, and the activity and responsibility of the LCY Central Committee and its Presidium are on the agenda. S. Suvar, chairman of the LCY Central Committee Presidium, delivered a report.

The immediate stabilization of the political situation within the country, which has deteriorated recently, he said, is the main condition for beginning extensive reforms.

In his report S. Suvar pointed out, in particular, that reducing the level of inflation is still the most important task facing society. He advocated pluralism within the framework of socialist self-management and renewal of the Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia.

Mentioning the criticism that has been leveled at the LCY Central Committee and its Presidium, S. Suvar pointed out that the main accusation concerns the party's inability to act as the leading force in society. He advocated the definition of both his own responsibility, the responsibility of the Presidium as a whole, and also the responsibility of republic, provincial, and all other leadership bodies and their members. Communists must fight for their ideas and aims using the force of argument, democracy, and resolute measures.

S. Suvar pointed out that the LCY has endeavored and is endeavoring to implement the reforms outlined, together with all working people and all social forces and groups. However, our weakness is the fact that we are insufficiently resolute in opposing a practice that is in effect channeled against the implementation of reform.

The chairman of the LCY Central Committee Presidium stated that the LCY Central Committee will examine the question of convening an extraordinary or early party congress at one of its next plenums. At present the most important thing to be done is to find a way to remove the disagreements within our ranks that caused the crisis in the LCY and in relations between republic and provincial party organizations and leadership bodies.

The plenum opened the debate on the main report.

West Europe

Scientist 'Disappears' in Paris, Emigrates to Israel

AU3101171589 Paris AFP in English 1704 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] Paris, Jan 31 (AFP)—A Soviet scientist, who was invited to France to attend a conference on telecommunications, failed to return to Moscow on Tuesday and has contacted officials at Israel's diplomatic mission here, informed sources said.

Computer software expert Iakov Kogan, a Jewish member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, was invited by the French Foreign Ministry's cultural department.

He arrived in France on January 22 and disappeared last Sunday. Mr. Kogan had been expected to return to the Soviet Union at the end of the conference.

Informed sources said he was staying at Israel's diplomatic mission here and could emigrate to Israel.

The Israeli Embassy was not immediately available for comment.

Becomes Israeli Citizen

TA0102061389 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0500 GMT 1 Feb 89

[Text] A Soviet mathematician who disappeared from a computer seminar in Paris 2 days ago has emigrated to Israel. The Foreign Ministry spokesman in Jerusalem said Yakov Kogan has become an Israeli citizen. The spokesman would not confirm speculation in Paris that Kogan had defected. He had not told colleagues of his plans.

Yakovlev, UK Envoy Discuss Gorbachev Visit

LD0102125389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1155 GMT 1 Feb 89

[Text] Moscow, 1 Feb (TASS)—Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, today received Rodric Braithwaite, Great Britain's ambassador to the USSR, at the latter's request. In a constructive conversation there was a discussion, within the context of Mikhail Gorbachev's forthcoming visit to Great Britain, of questions concerning USSR-UK relations and the state of affairs in Europe and the world.

Daily Interviews UK's Howe; Comments on Remarks

PM0102111589 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 Feb 89 p 9

["Topical Interview" in Vienna with British Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe by APN Political Observer Vladimir Simonov: "'Genuine Changes in the World'"; date not given]

[Text] [Simonov] I happened to be in London when the tragedy hit Armenia. I was struck by the explosion of human compassion in Britain at the time. I thought: What if the earthquake had happened 14 years ago, at the start of what we today call the Helsinki process? The reaction might have been quite different. What has changed in the world, Sir Geoffrey?

[Howe] I think the main change has been brought about by the influence of glasnost. If you were to take us all back 14 years, perhaps the world would never have learned of an earthquake on a scale such as the one in Armenia. Because of the restrictions on information passed to the outside world. Today the world knows about it, and it proved to be a tragedy on such a major scale that the spirit of humanity common to all mankind called for action.

Do you remember how, during your childhood, our people—the British—responded to the drama of Stalingrad? To the Soviet people's courage and the horrors which fell to their lot? In this sense the Armenian tragedy has met with the same response in Britain in recent weeks. Our government provided the sum of 5 million pounds sterling. We recently sent an official mission to see how the best use can be made of the remaining funds. The multifaceted assistance being given by ordinary Britons, by volunteers, by those who make donations out of their own pockets, is far more important than the sum provided by the government. They have collected more than 5 million pounds. That is, people have responded with greater generosity than the government. I think this says a great deal about how we feel the need to help one another at such times.

[Simonov] The breakthrough at the Vienna CSCE meeting and the adoption of its final document happened soon after M.S. Gorbachev's UN speech. He announced then a substantial unilateral reduction in the Soviet Armed Forces and armaments. Is there, in your view, a link between the two events?

[Howe] I think Gorbachev's speech assisted the process of completing the conference in two respects. First, there was his statement concerning the intention to change the system of legislation in the Soviet Union so as to provide more earnest guarantees of respect for human rights. We attach great significance to seeing these rights underpinned by laws. Second, the aspect you touched on: Gorbachev's acknowledgment of the need to reduce Soviet superiority in conventional arms and the readiness he has shown to tackle this. All this provides an encouraging start for the talks which will be held here with a view to striking a balance in conventional armed forces between the two blocs.

[Simonov] The final document of the Vienna meeting contains new and extremely important accords among the CSCE participant states in the humanitarian sphere. Does it not seem to you that such an extensive package of pledges would hardly have been adopted without the democratization of society which is taking place in the Soviet Union today?

[Howe] I think so. I have already said to several Western journalists that, when I first began discussing human rights with my Soviet colleague 5 years ago, this was a topic which was hardly ever included on the agenda of talks if it was a question of human rights in the Soviet Union. However, at subsequent meetings which I had with Mr Gorbachev and Mr Shevardnadze it became a legitimate item on the agenda for animated discussion. This means that we can all expect progress to be made. And this is very important. I believe we would also like to see progress in the human rights sphere in certain other East European countries. I named some of them in my speech—ones where such progress is not in evidence. We would like all of Eastern Europe to progress towad the norms which we are endeavoring to establish.

[Simonov] As is known, M.S. Gorbachev has put forward the concept of the "common European home." Could you share your thoughts on this?

[Howe] When the war ended in 1945, we created conditions for the "common European home" to be built. Unfortunately, we created a divided "European house."

In the West we founded an efficient mechanism for asserting and protecting human rights. This did not happen in the East. A great watershed arose between Europe's two houses. The 1975 Helsinki Final Act was designed to build a bridge over this watershed and encourage the attainment of common norms. And the Helsinki process, which has been developed at the Vienna meeting, is contributing to this.

[Simonov] On the threshold of M.S. Gorbachev's expected visit to Britain I would be interested to learn, Sir Geoffrey, what influence, in your opinion, Anglo-Soviet relations might have on the future of Europe.

[Howe] I think the most important feature of the discussions taking place between your country and ours has been the frankness and clarity of the dialogue—a quality inherent in it since the first moment of Mrs Thatcher's first meeting with Mr Gorbachev. The premier spoke bluntly of the differences in our way of life and the differences between the alliances to which we belong. She said that we do not agree on certain problems and that we must not look at each other through rose-tinted glasses. However, there are other important goals in respect of which we can reach agreement. In my opinion, this is precisely what has characterized the dialogue between our countries since then. We are frank with one another and so have been able to find spheres where progress is possible. Thus we have reached the conclusion that there is a possibility of formulating terms for the talks on conventional armed forces which will begin in 2 months. This is where agreement helps.

[Simonov] I noticed the following detail: You entered this room and touched the leaves of a decorative plant over in the corner. The flower proved to be artificial. This is a metaphor, as it were, for my last question—do you consider the positive changes that have occurred in the world to be real and genuine? Or do you have doubts, like those who refer to the fragile detente of the seventies?

[Howe] The changes that have already occurred are genuine. The intention to implement changes is still waiting to be realized. So far all is going well.

LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Postscript

Some points in the British secretary's replies may puzzle our readers somewhat. "We would like all of East Europe to progress toward the norms which we are endeavoring to establish." Does this not smack of the didacticism of a schoolmaster admonishing backsliding pupils? Clearly, the struggle for human rights should not mean East Europe's jumping over a stick set up by the West. This is also far removed even from biblical norms in some respects. But this enforced ping-pong of recriminations is a futile, archaic occupation. It is up to everyone to improve his own democracy, but in cooperation, in search of the other side's acceptable experience. This is the worth of the fragile subject called "human rights," which calls for tolerance.

Talks Held With French Industrial Delegation

LD3001233389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1743 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow, 30 Jan (TASS)—Further improving Soviet-French relations in the economic sphere, developing business links between Soviet and French industrial enterprises, and regional cooperation were discussed at a meeting between Roger Fauroux, the French industry and land management minister, and Vladimir Golanov, acting chairman of the USSR CCI, USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Presidium; held here today. The French minister heads a delegation that is staying in the USSR at the invitation of the USSR CCI. The delegation includes senior officials from the French Ministry of Industry, an aide to the prime minister, officials from the Foreign Ministry, and French businessmen.

In an interview with a TASS correspondent, Vladimir Golanov said that the main goal of his visit is to study matters of bilateral economic cooperation raised during the visit to the USSR of French President Francois Mitterrand and to define the range of problems in this sphere for the visit to France by Mikhail Gorbachev.

At the talks, Vladimir Golanov reported, both sides expressed dissatisfaction with the current state of Soviet-French economic relations. It was noted that one of the basic ways of stepping up relations might be to expand trade, economic, and cooperative links between the enterprises of the two countries to further develop joint enterprises. However, all of this is unthinkable without qualified cadres. He said a proposal was presented to jointly work out a program for training Soviet specialists in management, finance, and legal control [regulirovaniye], using the existing potential of French educational establishments and firms.

He reported that an accord was reached on the visit of French industry representatives to Soviet enterprises with the aim of studying the possibilities for developing production cooperatives, creating joint enterprises, and working on the markets of third countries.

Vladimir Golanov noted that there is particular interest in a proposal to develop cooperation in the sphere of processing secondary resources, in which France has much experience.

The French delegation familiarized itself with the course of restructuring, progress in the foreign economic activity of the USSR, and changes in the USSR Chamber of Trade and Industry system. They expressed interest in matters of expanding the sphere of the convertible ruble and creating a wholesale market in the USSR.

French Minister Hails Joint Ventures

PM3101164389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Roger Fauroux, French minister of industry and land management, by own correspondent Yu. Kovalenko under the rubric "IZVESTIYA Interview": "French Businessmen Favor an Expansion of Business Contacts"; date of interview not given; first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] Paris—A delegation of French business circles headed by Roger Fauroux, minister of industry and land management, is leaving Paris for the Soviet Union. On the eve of their departure the minister answered a number of questions from your correspondent.

[Kovalenko] Mr Minister, you accompanied President F. Mitterrand on his visit to the Soviet Union in November 1988. Two months later you are again traveling to our country at the head of a representative delegation of French industrialists. What is the aim of your visits? What do you expect from the talks with Soviet partners?

[Fauroux] The visit of the president of the French Republic marked a new beginning in Franco-Soviet relations. Ministerial visits are to take place in order to develop the results of that visit. This is why I am going to Moscow to continue what we have begun. I am being accompanied by representatives of business circles, and this will add much greater weight to my trip and will facilitate mutually complementary cooperation between our two countries in the industry sphere.

[Kovalenko] What are the main objectives of your policy in the sphere of industrial exchanges with the Soviet Union?

[Fauroux] I would like above all to underline the task of diversifying our exchanges in the sphere of industry, and in particular in the production of consumer goods, textile and clothing industry goods, for instance, which is in keeping with your new goals. I am also seeking to balance this sphere because at the moment there is a considerable deficit to our disadvantage. A number of the representatives of business circles who are accompanying me have never dealt with the Soviet market and I would therefore like to facilitate their first contacts.

[Kovalenko] Moscow and Paris have at the highest political level noted more than once the need to develop bilateral economic relations. Nonetheless, essentially little progress has been made. What is preventing it? How can existing obstacles be removed? What do you expect from M.S. Gorbachev's upcoming visit to France?

[Fauroux] The political will to expand economic exchanges does exist on both sides, of course, and it serves to stimulate progress. I believe that the new status of joint ventures in the Soviet Union will enable us to develop our exchanges. Anything that is conducive to protecting the interests of enterprises in legal and material terms will be a step in the right direction. We hope that in the near future an agreement will be concluded between our two countries which will make provision for boosting capital investments and for their protection. In addition, in view of the changes which are taking place in your country, our enterprises will have to adapt to the new situation. It is a question here of temporary difficulties which can be resolved in each individual case in the context of the favorable Franco-Soviet relations.

Mr Gorbachev's upcoming visit to France is prompting both sides to pursue concrete results. This is why we must make progress.

[Kovalenko] Does not COCOM [Coordinating Committee on Multilateral Export Controls] represent one of the main impediments to the expansion of exchanges in the industry sphere?

[Fauroux] I do not believe that the observance by France of international commitments can become a serious obstacle to the development of our exchanges. The duty of any country is to take account of strategic imperatives. This is equally true of both France and the Soviet Union. We take care that the controls apply only to what is absolutely essential. The potential for the two countries' industries to mutually complement each other is far from exhausted.

[Kovalenko] The USSR and France favor the conclusion of an agreement on the development of economic, technical, and industrial cooperation and a long-term program covering the period 1990-2000. What, in your view, should be the specific content of these documents?

[Fauroux] I believe that in the sphere of long-term industrial cooperation it is necessary to outline major objectives, bearing in mind that enterprises will have to operate within the framework of what will be decided at the political level. I would like us to ensure that we do not confine ourselves only to the "heavyweights" of French industry which are familiar with the Soviet market but that we also involve the "lightweights," that is, small and medium enterprises which have a potential we do not even suspect. It is necessary to broaden on both sides the circle of enterprises and organizations which take part in industrial cooperation.

[Kovalenko] Will the upcoming establishment of the single European market by the 12 EEC countries affect our trade and economic relations?

[Fauroux] The creation of the single European market does not mean that Europe is cutting itself off. On the contrary, this is to promote, on a more uniform and better organized basis, the development of exchanges with the Soviet Union. After all, it is not a question of building a fortress which would be cut off from the main avenues of international exchanges. It seems obvious

that a state or enterprises which want to export their goods to European community countries must also agree to open their borders to goods from these states.

[Kovalenko] Soviet enterprises have been authorized to directly enter foreign markets. Is this likely to facilitate the conclusion of new contracts with French companies?

[Fauroux] Anything that serves to promote the independence of Soviet enterprises on the domestic market and in respect of their foreign ties can only facilitate our exchanges. I believe that the elimination of rigid administrative structures is always beneficial for enterprises. I am convinced that Soviet enterprises stand to gain from this. Anyway, how can enterprises exist if they do not have to contend with international competition?

[Kovalenko] At present there are about a dozen Soviet-French joint enterprises. How promising is this sphere of cooperation?

[Fauroux] I view this form of cooperation with optimism. The Pechiney company has just established a joint enterprise—the Kanaker plant in Yerevan—which is the biggest enterprise ever set up with French and Soviet participation. This is of symbolic importance. Other joint enterprises will follow. I very much hope that the Soviet authorities will facilitate the negotiations which are currently under way. One success leads to another, and the formula of the establishment of joint enterprises may undergo staggering development even if it does not produce miracles. It can however considerably expand the circle of those who take part in industrial cooperation. Learning to work in accordance with a contract is a very useful thing. However, contracts are often confined to set periods of time. Learning to work within the framework of a joint enterprise, shoulder to shoulder, is much more promising for both, the establishment of stable relations and the further development of industry.

[Kovalenko] How do you assess the economic reform which is currently being implemented in the Soviet Union?

[Fauroux] I believe that the economic reforms in the Soviet Union are going in the right direction, that is to say in the direction of greater independence, enhanced responsibility, and self-financing. Anything that facilitates production processes is a positive factor. The Soviet Union must benefit from these new trends even if, at present, they are clashing with deep-rooted old methods of management.

CPSU Environment Experts, FRG Greens Hold Seminar

LD3101123989 Hamburg DPA in German 1106 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—The Soviet Union intends to utilize the findings of Federal Republic antinuclear scientists in the development of alternative energy sources. This was announced by Yevgenyi Ignatenko, department head at the Moscow Nuclear Energy Ministry and Chernobyl expert, in Bonn today after a first joint seminar of the Greens and CPSU environmental and energy experts. The Oekionstitut in Freiburg invited Soviet scientists concerned with research into the rational use of energy and the use of reuseable energies.

The Soviet delegation was headed by the Central Committee member Ivan Frolov, who was introduced as the personal assistant of party leader Mikhail Gorbachev for environmental issues. He, together with Jutta Ditfurth of the Greens, reviewed positively the 4-day seminar held in Goehrde, Lower Saxony. The existing differences on nuclear power stations have not been overcome; heated discussion "in a friendly atmosphere" took place, Frolov said. The Soviet Union is extremely interested in the possibilities of using alternative energy sources such as water, wind, and heat from the earth and the sun. The Soviets also showed that they are aware of the problems regarding the burning of coal and oil, whose emissions contribute considerably to the "greenhouse effect."

Both parties agreed to continue the seminar in Moscow in the summer when, Frau Ditfurth said, a public function with representatives of the Greens and the antinuclear power movement from the Federal Republic would be held in the Soviet Union for the first time. Frolov, in reply to questions, said that there are "any number of informal environmental groups" in the Soviet Union who mainly oppose local projects. In view of the still-existing resistance in many areas of Soviet industry and administration to pro-environmental attitudes, pressure from these groups is important.

Spanish Stance on Near East Settlement Lauded

PM0102095589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jan 89 Second Edition pp 1,5

[Own correspondent Valeriy Volkov dispatch under the rubric "Abroad. Correspondents Comment": "Constructive Realism"]

[Text] Madrid—PLO leader Y. 'Arafat's visit to Spain has ended. Political observers point out that he was effectively accorded the reception due a head of state.

Y. 'Arafat had meetings and conversations with F. Gonzalez, chairman of the Spanish Government; King Juan Carlos I; Foreign Minister F. Ordonez, and representatives of the country's main political parties.

Talks were held here between the European "Three" (the foreign ministers of France, Greece, and Spain) and the PLO leader, and definite progress was made on the question of preparing for an international conference on a Near East settlement under UN auspices.

Expressing satisfaction at the EEC representatives' position on this question, Y. 'Arafat stated at a news conference that the European states, along with the USSR and the United States, can and should play a more significant

role in settling the conflict in the Near East and exert definite pressure on Israel, which opposes the holding of an international forum involving the PLO. The PLO leader proposed creating in the near future a preparatory committe for holding an international conference made up of UN Security Council representatives.

The Spanish press expressed a high opinion of Y. 'Arafat's diplomatic "tact." As is well known, the PLO leader—aware of the different viewpoints among the EEC countries regarding recognition of the Palestinian state during official talks—refrained from focusing his partners' attention on this problem. In turn Spanish Foreign Minister F. Ordonez stated that each of the European Community states will resolve this question independently. As for Madrid's stance, according to an official government spokesman, "there would be no obstacles to such a step if Spain were not at present the president of the EEC."

Spain's efforts to asdvance a Near East peace settlement have met with understanding and support in Western Europe. F. Ordonez' recent visit to Israel, the talks in Madrid with representatives of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Saquia El Hamra and Rio de Oro, which advocates independence for the Western Sahara, and the foreign policy department chief's coming trip to Egypt and other Near East countries attest that the Spanish Government, which proclaimed the Near East a priority area for its EEC presidency, is giving specific substance to its words.

All indications are that Spain's desire to play the role of "intermediary" in dialogue between Western Europe and the Arab countries that rely on traditionally close relations with Near East states is becoming a reality. The stance taken by official Madrid, which has always favored implementing the UN resolutions on the Near East and has supported the right of the people of Palestine to self-determination, is facilitating this.

Kovalev Receives New Luxembourg Ambassador
PM3101161189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] A.G. Kovalev, USSR first deputy foreign minister, received J. Wurth, Luxembourg ambassador to the USSR, in connection with the upcoming presentation of his credentials.

Latin America & Caribbean

Navy Commander in Chief Arrives in Cuba for Visit
LD0102092789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0750 GMT 1 Feb 89

[Text] Havana, 1 Feb (TASS)—At the invitation of Army General Raul Castro Ruz, second secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba [PCC] Central Committee, first vice president of the Councils of State and of Ministers, and minister of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of the Republic of Cuba, Fleet Admiral V.N. Chernavin, commander in chief of the USSR Navy and USSR deputy minister of defense has arrived in cuba on an official frendly visit.

At Jose Marti International Airport he was met by Rear Admiral Pedro M. Perez Betancourt, alternate member of the PCC Central Committee, deputy minister of the Revolutionary Armed Forces, commander of the Revolutionary Navy of the Republic of Cuba, and other officials.

Fleet Admiral V.N. Chernavin laid wreaths at the mausoleum of Cuba's national hero Antonio Maceo, at the tomb of famous leader of the Cuban Communists Blas Roca, and at the monument of the Soviet internationalist soldier in Havana. The Soviet guest had a meeting with Rear Adm Pedro M. Perez Betancourt. During the conversation, which was held in a friendly and cordial atmosphere, there was discussion of questions of further strengthening cooperation and combat collaboration between the USSR Armed Forces and the Revolutinary Armed Forces of Cuba, and between the navies of the two countries.

Yakovlev Receives Cuba's Risquet for Talks 27 Jan
PM3101154389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jan 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Talks at CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] On 27 January A.N. Yakovlev held talks with J. Risquet, member of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee Politburo and Secretariat, who is in Moscow in connection with the holding of a Soviet-U.S.-Cuban symposium on the Caribbean crisis.

Questions of Soviet-Cuban relations and of the two countries' cooperation in the international arena and urgent problems of world politics were examined during the talks, which were held in a warm and friendly atmosphere. The interlocutors expressed a desire to continue closely coordinating the two fraternal parties' foreign policy activity.

Political & Social

Further on Nominations of Deputy Candidates

***PRAVDA Notes Process 'Lessons'**
WA18000454 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jan 89 p 3

[Article by V. Lyubitskiy: "The Nomination of Candidates: Lessons and Conclusions"]

[Text] **"The schedule again"... Workers at the Chernigov Rubber Factory were indignant when the obkom chairman of the textile and light industry workers trade union, T. Revenko, issued an "instruction" about who should be nominated as candidate for the post of people's deputy. The secretary of the party bureau at the enterprise, L. Sherelo, wrote to the editor about this (PRAVDA 3 January). And now a report from the secretary of the Chernigov party obkom, L. Mysnik: the incident was condemned by the party committee of the oblast trade union and the bureau of the Ukrainian Communist Party Desnyanskiy raykom for the incorrect approach to the organization of election work and CPSU member T. Revenko was censured, and steps have been taken to democratize the election campaign.**

And so, under conditions of people's awakened interest and revitalized civic dignity, finding out things the hard way and ridding ourselves of the outworn methods of "managing democracy," we have passed through the first crucial stage of preparations for the elections. Of course, in- depth analysis of this still lies ahead but already, on the threshold of the next stage, it makes sense to assess what is most significant in the experience gained and draw from it the necessary lessons for tomorrow.

Of course, wherever our political institutions had been renewed, right from the start they conducted themselves in the proper manner and there were no problems. For example, nine candidates were nominated for one mandate in the Central territorial electoral district in Omsk city at meetings in the shops and sections of the "Mikrokriogenmash" Scientific Production Association. And, as PRAVDA correspondent Yu. Shpakov reports, a fierce fight broke out at the final conference of the representatives of the collectives. The representatives of the CPSU obkom and oblispolkom present sat not in the presidium but in the hall. The labor collective council held a discussion, acting without "input" and without scenery, which not only helped free clarification of the positions of the candidates but also brought to the hall an atmosphere of real democracy. The machine builders voted in the general director of the scientific production association, A. Grezin; the vote was 342 out of 430.

But it must be admitted that many of the lessons of democracy are not easy. Kiev PRAVDA correspondents M. Odintsev and I. Tikhomirov reported the following, for example. When general designer P. Balabuyev was nominated at the mechanical plant imeni O. Antonov, few doubted that we would be successful. However, the candidate failed to receive support. In the gorkom it was concluded that the party organization at the enterprise "had not mastered the situation." But the deputy secretary of the plant party committee V. Ivanov had a different assessment of what had happened: "We were in too much of a hurry. But there was an instruction: 'conduct the nominations energetically but slowly.' If only we had listened..."

It must be said that signals about haste in the nomination of candidates have also been arriving in the editorial office from other places. The authors of some letters even think that in some places the atmosphere of haste was deliberately created by the organizers of the election campaign so that, according to N. Bezatosnyy from the Bashkir city of Salavat, "with the greater confusion it would be more convenient to push through suitable people." But did they not know about the upcoming elections in the collectives before the meetings were convened? Did they not think about whom they wanted to see as deputies? Of course they knew, and of course they thought about it. But... they are used to waiting for instructions, when "it is possible to make the nominations," on which day the meeting should be held and so forth, even though the election law had defined all procedural matters concerning the elections.

However, in fact things did not go off without relapses into the earlier, conventional attitude toward the will of the electorate. "At our factory," write Chub, Anashkina, Desyatova and other workers at the Leningrad "Skorokhod" Association, "in the cloth-cutting facility the meeting was somewhat confused and took place during a 30-minute rest break. First a lecturer spoke on the subject of "The Psychology of Family Life," then the challenge banners were quickly displayed, and then, as if incidentally, they said that we must offer our candidate nominations... There were few people in the shop. No minutes were kept of the meeting. Only one candidate was nominated. True, the administration justified this by saying that it could do nothing else and that the trade union obkom was to blame for everything. You should have elected them yourselves in the obkom, it had nothing to do with us!"

The indignation of the authors of this letter is understandable and justified. But again the question arises: why did you not oppose this? Why did you just vote anyway? Why did you allow yourselves to be ordered about? "The administration paid no heed to the shouts of the workers," the letter says. But one of the lessons of democracy that is not easy to master is that the time has come not to shout but to make decisions. To make decisions ourselves, to think for ourselves, to approve new forms of lower-level democratic dealings ourselves.

In this sense a telegram from Ivanteyevka city near Moscow is typical: "The Dmitrovskiy electoral district No 29. The election law is being violated with regard to the nomination of candidates at place of residence. We

ask you to send a correspondent." It came during the weekend and was read on the Monday, and, as is known, on Tuesday the nomination of candidates was ended. But what is the sense of calling on the editorial office for "emergency help"? Wherever the law is being violated they must act according to the law: complaints about illegal actions should be directed to the district, or if necessary, the central electoral commission. In a legal state the press must, of course, draw the attention of the public to such cases, but it cannot fulfill, as it used to, a legal regulatory function. And so now, at the stage of registration and contention among candidates, the law also provides open public control over observance of democratic guarantees.

At the same time attempts are sometimes made to use the press and television not so much to prove an argument in the election struggle but rather for noisy demonstrations and patent self-advertising. This is precisely what is indicated by a story coming from Stavropol that was told by KOMSOMLSKAYA PRAVDA and central television. PRAVDA also received a telegram indicating that "candidate of philosophical sciences Znacheyeva, member of the Union of Journalists Krasulya, and candidate of biological sciences Nesis, had started a hunger strike as a protest," demanding that a meeting of electors be convened at the place of residence.

On assignment from the editor, our correspondent V. Pankratov looked into the situation. The city authorities, he reports, failed to explain to people in good time the procedure for the convening of election meetings and committed the sin of "over-organization" at the first of them, held in the Palace of Culture and Technology imeni Gagarin. But the methods of the "initiative group"—falsification of signatures as a demand for the convening of a meeting, the hunger strike (which, incidentally, was undertaken in order to get that permission), and a "salvo" of telegrams to all-union institutions—brought it nothing except notoriety. At the next meeting the inhabitants who had gathered in the formal hall of the kray Potrebsoyuz, gave their absolute support to another candidate.

And here we have another lesson from the foregoing stage of the election campaign: people can today no longer be distracted by phrases about restructuring; trust is shown only for those from whom constructive ideas are heard and practical deeds expected. Too much in the fate of the country depends on the present political reform and on the results of the upcoming elections to allow ourselves to be deceived by demagogues or to allow democracy to be turned into a farce. What, for example, was the point of a statement made by one of the "candidates" in the capital's "Minsk" movie theater, who (evidently as a "prototype" of his future actions as a deputy) told how he had tried to resolve the problem of handling glass containers: "I took it and went to the Mossovet with an empty bottle... They did not allow this. As a mark of protest I lay down in the doorway..."

Why do such "claimants" aspire to the country's highest tribune? For there are instances of exactly the opposite—when people nominated really for their services, nevertheless object to their own nomination. This, for example, is what V. Mikhaylov, a fitter at the Chita locomotive repair plant, did. While having experience in work as a deputy he refused to be a candidate for USSR deputy when he heard that all they wanted him to do was provide help for the plant in insuring supplies of raw materials. "A people's deputy of the USSR is primarily a political figure, not a high-level supply official," he said. At a plenum of the AUCCTU, declining to accept nomination, G. Lipina, the chairman of the Kazan meat combine trade union, said: "I shall not be able to work with all my strength because of family commitments, and I have no right to give it half my attention." And the plenum assessed this level of responsibility as is right and proper.

And what do those who strive by all means to gain a mandate as deputy really want? Let us assume just for a moment that they really want to participate in finding solutions to the economic and social problems that have built up. But, first, the glasnost now extending through society enables not only the person with the deputy's badge to be heard and understood. And second, their "parliamentary" methods—not through democracy but by making the rounds or "across" it—force us to have doubts about the correctness of these claims. And, of course, despite the certain haste in the election campaign, people are managing to decide who's who and what they stand for, as they will also surely do at the next stage of the election struggle when they meet with their own candidates.

Much that is new has been brought by the nominations for the posts of deputy from the public organizations, for the first time not only here but even in world practice. As a rule it has started from the lower cells, and it appears that the party, trade unions, Komsomol, cooperative and women's organizations and the creative unions have at their disposal an enormous human potential for restructuring—hundreds and thousands of active devotees of restructuring have been named among those who may be elected. Naturally, they have not all been included on the list of candidates for USSR people's deputies but their experience, knowledge and energy cannot go unremarked. These people—leaders not according to the posts that they occupy but in and of themselves—must undoubtedly become a bulwark in the work of the primary party organizations and local organs. In all probability they can become members of future councils at all levels.

Alas, here also those adhering to stereotypes and misgivings that "nothing has come of it" have repeatedly made themselves felt. Some administrators "from the public" through their actions have, as it were, tried to confirm the very worst predictions made earlier about the relatively direct representation of the public organizations. In particular, members of the All-Union Council of

Kolkhozes have been virtually deprived of the right to be nominated: the lists of candidates were prepared not by the election commission but by a certain "working group" of the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee, and the final result was summed by the council presidium—essentially behind closed doors. In other cases the lower-level organizations have deliberately proposed many candidates, thus in effect giving up their own democratic rights by transferring the decision to the "higher" organs.

We have witnessed a quite new phenomenon in our election practice: a person who has failed to gain a majority vote in one organization has been nominated in another, or for a territorial district. It is not a simple matter to assess this. On the one hand it has become possible to reduce to a minimum attempts to bar the road to "unsuitable" but truly authoritative public figures. On the other hand, where are the guarantees that this kind of opportunity is not taken advantage of by a person with far from righteous principles and motivations? We think, notwithstanding, that as we introduce the new democratic standards we must be consistent. And can nomination in another place be regarded as democratic if a person has not passed muster in his own collective, where he is best known, but no interest is shown in the opinion of that collective?

...Yes, this last month has really extended our ideas about the opportunities of socialist democracy, enriched its experience, and reassured us in the search for ways to further develop it. There are still mistakes and much still has to be learned. But even the mistakes are proof not of stagnation but of movement. And if there is movement, then this means that we are closer to our goal.

Self-Management Committee Candidates

PM3101141989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by IZVESTIYA special correspondent A. Stepovoy under the rubric "Elections of USSR People's Deputies": "The Brateyevo Phenomenon. Growing Prestige of Members of Social Self-Management Committee"]

[Excerpts] Moscow—Just 4 months ago, many people felt that the residents of Moscow's Brateyevo district had rather lost their grip on reality. It was hardly conceivable: They had decided to create a new organ of people's power in their own residential district... Doubts were soon dispelled, however: The people of Brateyevo held a constituent conference and created the first social self-management committee in Moscow (IZVESTIYA No 273 for 1988 discussed this event in a report entitled "From a Civic Standpoint"). Soon after, a session of the Krasnogvardeyskiy Rayon Soviet gave legal recognition to this public organization.

Now Moscow's first social self-management committee is the center of attention again. The other day the Krasnogvardeyskiy Rayispolkom and the okrug electoral commission of Krasnogvardeyskiy Electoral Okrug No 10 announced the nomination of a candidate deputy to represent the people of Brateyevo residential district. At that moment I recalled the words of T. Konovalova, head of the Krasnogvardeyskiy Rayispolkom Organization and Instruction Department, spoken 4 months before:

"I know many of the people elected to the social self-management committee. Almost every one of them is a ready-made deputy."

The words of the ispolkom official had proved to be prophetic.

Real concern for the needs of people living in Brateyevo district, precise and consistent protection of their interests, and loyalty to their word have earned a number of members of the social self-management committee firm authority. The residents trust them and now want their representatives to have new opportunities to defend their principles, views, and opinions. The committee members were first instructed to discuss potential candidates among themselves and then to put forward proposals at a voters' meeting.

I was present at that session of the social self-management committee. I must point out that not everyone immediately realized that they were discussing possible candidates for USSR people's deputy. Not candidates for the rayon soviet or even the city soviet, but candidates for the people's soviet. It was only long after midnight that the debates died down and emotions subsided...

The spacious hall of the "Moskvorechye" Cultural Center could not accommodate all those wishing to attend the election meeting. So they had to open up another small hall for them and then set up loudspeakers in the lobby and even in the street, so that everyone who had come to the meeting was aware of everything that was going on. I no longer know whether to enthuse over this influx of voters or to regard it as a normal occurrence... Perhaps I should get used to the latter interpretation... After all, when people have the right to choose and they know well the people from whom they must make their choice, it is no longer a mere declaration of civic duty but the performance of that duty. Hence the reaction.

So the social self-management committee proposed that the people of Krasnogvardeyskiy Rayon support the candidacies of three of its members: S. Druganov, V. Vasiliadi, and S. Nikiforov. The latter, however, withdrew his candidacy during the meeting, and so there were two contenders left for the title of candidate USSR people's deputy. Who were they?

Viktor Ivanovich Vasiliadi, 42 years old, a member of the CPSU, graduate of the Gnesinykh Music Teacher Training Institute, and artistic leader of the "Litsey" Chamber Ensemble (Moskontsert).

Sergey Petrovich Druganov, 35 years old, member of the CPSU, candidate of economic sciences, with a first degree in economics, law, and education. He works as senior lecturer at the Central State Institute of Physical Culture in the History of the CPSU and Political Economy Department. [passage omitted]

"We were the first in the country to form such an organ of people's power, but we are still unique and 'experimental,' so to speak," Sergey Petrovich noted at the end of his speech. "Hence the need to draft a law on local self-management."

Whose attitude had proved the most serious and attractive? This question was answered by the vote, in which more than 1,000 people took part. Sergey Petrovich Druganov emerged the victor, by an overwhelming majority. He was through to the next round in the election battle, thereby drawing one step closer to the goal which, until quite recently, had seemed an impossible dream to him.

The real development of our society's democratization process is probably seen most easily in such simple examples of people's greatly increased political activeness.

*More on Journalist, Writer Candidates

WA18000455 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 28 Jan 89 p 2

[Unattributed article: "Candidates Are Named"; for further reportage on the nomination of candidates from the USSR Journalists' Union, see the Political & Social section of the 30 Jan Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, p 53]

[Text]

From the USSR Union of Journalists

The electoral commission of the USSR Union of Journalists has registered the following as candidate people's deputies of the USSR:

Batynskaya, Lyudmila Ivanovna, born in 1950, editor of the kray newspaper KRASNOYARSKIY KOMSOMOLETS, Krasnoyarsk.

Bovin, Aleksandr Yevgenyevich, born in 1930, political commentator for the newspaper IZVESTIYA, Moscow.

Duyseyev, Korik Kundyzbayevich, born in 1936, secretary of the executive board of the USSR Union of Journalists, chairman of the executive board of the Kazakh SSR Union of Journalists, editor of the republic newspaper SOTSIALISTIK KAZAKHSTAN, Alma-Ata.

Yezhelev, Anatoliy Stepanovich, born in 1932, chief of the Leningrad correspondent's office of the newspaper IZVESTIYA, Leningrad.

Zuykov, Vladimir Parmenovich, born in 1952, editor of the large-circulation newspaper STROITEL, Tyumen.

Kravchenko, Leonid Petrovich, born in 1938, deputy chairman of the executive board of the USSR Union of Journalists, general director of TASS, Moscow.

Kucher, Valeriy Nikolayevich, born in 1941, editor of the city newspaper MAGNITOGORSKIY RABOCHIY, Magnitogorsk, Chelyabinsk Oblast.

Latsis, Otto Rudolfovich, born in 1934, first deputy editor-in-chief of the journal KOMMUNIST, Moscow.

Mukhtarov, Akhmedzhan Gulyamovich, born in 1936, chairman of the executive board of the Uzbek SSR Union of Journalists, editor of the republic newspaper KISHLOK KHAKHIKATI, Tashkent.

Ovchinnikov, Vsevolod Vladimirovich, born in 1926, political commentator for the newspaper PRAVDA, Moscow.

Panov, Ivan Mitrofanovich, born in 1927, secretary of the executive board of the USSR Union of Journalists, editor-in-chief of the newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, Moscow.

Poltoranin, Mikhail Nikiforovich, born in 1939, secretary of the executive board of the USSR Union of Journalists, secretary of the executive board of the Moscow city organization of journalists, political commentator of APN, Moscow.

Seleznev, Gennadiy Nikolayevich, born in 1947, secretary of the executive board of the USSR Union of Journalists, editor-in-chief of UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA, Moscow.

Shibik, Nikolay Aleksandrovich, born in 1930, secretary of the executive board of the USSR Union of Journalists, chairman of the executive board of the Ukrainian SSR Union of Journalists, editor of the republic newspaper RABOCHAYA GAZETA, Kiev.

Shnyukas, Domiyonas Yurgevich, born in 1932, chairman of the executive board of the Lithuanian SSR Union of Journalists, PRAVDA correspondent for the Lithuanian SSR and Kaliningrad Oblast, Vilnius.

From the USSR Union of Writers

The electoral commission of the USSR Union of Writers has registered the following as candidate people's deputies of the USSR:

Astafyev, Viktor Petrovich, born in 1924, writer, Krasnoyarsk.

Voronov, Yuriy Petrovich, born in 1929, writer, editor-in-chief of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, Moscow.

Bykov, Vasiliy Vladimirovich, born in 1924, writer, Minsk.

Gonchar, Aleksandr Terentyevich, born in 1918, writer, Kiev.

Zalygin, Sergey Pavlovich, born in 1913, writer, editor-in-chief of the journal NOVYY MIR, Moscow.

Martsinkyavichus, Yustinas Moteyevich, born in 1930, writer, Vilnius.

Leonov, Leonid Maksimovich, born in 1899, writer, Moscow.

Rasputin, Valentin Grigoryevich, born in 1937, writer, Irkutsk.

Sangi, Vladimir Mikhaylovich, born in 1935, writer, Moscow.

Chiladze, Otar Ivanovich, born in 1933, writer, Tbilisi.

Chobanu (Cheban), Ivan Konstantinovich, born in 1927, writer, first secretary of the Moldavian Union of Writers, Kishinev.

Yakubov, Adyl, born in 1926, writer, first secretary of the Uzbek Union of Writers, Tashkent.

Uzbek SSR's KGB Chief Dies 'Suddenly'

PM0102090989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Feb 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "From the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium announces with profound regret that Lieutenant General Vladimir Aleksandrovich Golovin, USSR Supreme Soviet deputy and chairman of the Uzbek SSR KGB, died suddenly 27 January 1989 at the age of 66.

Uzbek Leadership Corruption Reviewed

LD2901150789 Moscow World Service in English 0310 GMT 29 Jan 89

[Text] [First announcer] The renewal of society and openness have exposed corruption among some top ranking officials. The investigator of specially important cases under the Procurator-General of the USSR, Nikolay Ivanov, and a group of assistants have investigated bribery among senior party and government officials and economic managers in Uzbekistan. The investigation continued for more than a year, and Uzbek leaders did all they could to impede it. The case is over, and the criminals have been punished. Has work become easier for investigators, or are they still under pressure from those in authority?

[Second announcer] Obviously any investigation directly depends on changes in the country. Although slowly, life in society has been changing for the better. Conservatives and dishonest people have been surrendering their positions one after another —although belatedly, the government has admitted that there is organized crime in this country and has proclaimed a course toward a state governed by law. Concrete steps have been taken to reform judiciary, humanize the law and democratize political life. All these were landmarks of the past year alone. A crime incurs criminal responsibility for its perpetrator even if he is a member of the party's Central Committee. Legal proceedings have been started lately against a number of persons who held responsible party or government posts in Uzbekistan in the past. Quiet recently they were legally untouchable and could influence the interpretation of the law themselves. Now high-ranking functionaries have been meddling much less in judiciary—although resistance to investigation has grown weaker it has been getting increasingly sophisticated and disguised.

[First announcer] The Uzbek case has been called an offspring of perestroyka in the press, it has been talked about at length in the news media. The overwhelming majority of people have supported the investigators, but what is behind the resistance to the investigation?

[Second announcer] This is only natural, no one surrenders power without a fight. Those who are held responsible, and their high-ranking backers, uphold their interests. Nor should we forget the enormous material values embezzled by criminals, (?whence) big opportunities for resistance. Besides, the conservatism of Soviet judiciary hinders investigation. On top of that there is implicit sabotage by procurator office functionaries and judicial officials. In fact these functionaries are still dependent on their superiors, and for this reason try to shield those of them who have discredited themselves. The fight against organized crime has just got underway [brief break in reception]. Only separate representatives of criminal clans have been exposed. As for the clans themselves and their might backers, the wealth they have looted is still in their possession. Corrupted persons have been exerting pressure on judicial authorities and have even been offering bribes, and if a case reaches a dishonest judge nothing can guarantee an impartial court hearing.

[First announcer] Any example of a biased court hearing?

[Second announcer] A case is sent to a court when there is ample evidence of the guilt of every member of a criminal group. In the second half of 1985 in Uzbekistan investigators had evidence of heavy bribes taken by republican leaders as well as trade officials in Bukhara, and some top interior officers. During a search they surrendered money, gold coins and jewelry worth more than R5,000,000; 170 witnesses directly exposed them of bribe taking and embezzlement. Traces led to the top

echelons of power in the republic. For this reason during a trial the mafia and its backers tried to discredit investigation materials in every way. They intimidated the witnesses, the local judicial authorities headed for acquitting the republic's leaders. Only interference by the Procurator's Office of the USSR helped to carry out judicial enquiry in accordance with the law. Much more is now required of all interrogation, investigation and court proceedings. This is a positive factor, there is no doubt that those who used to regard themselves as being above the law will not escape punishment if they are found guilty.

*Resignation of Uzbek President Detailed

WA18300264 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 4, 25 Jan 89 p 10

[Article by V. Sokolov: "Resignation of the President"; for further reportage on the resignation of chairman of the Presidium of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet, president of the republic Pulat Khabibullayev, see the Political & Social section of the 24 January Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, p 66, and the 25 January Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, p 48]

[Text] Twice recently—both at a regional and a city party conference—deputy secretary of the Tashkent State University Party Committee Marat Zakhidov took the floor. He criticized... the chairman of the presidium of the republic supreme soviet.

The rank-and-file Communist stated that Comrade Khabibullayev, a member of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee Bureau, chairman of the Presidium of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet, in his recent position as president of the republic Academy of Sciences, used liberally his personal conduits to the leaders of the republic who have compromised themselves, was obsequious towards them, arranged for the career and academic advancement of their relatives, violated financial discipline, and got carried away being a co-author with outstanding scientists and specialists.

This pronouncement in and of itself cannot be but acknowledged as testimony to profound changes underway in Uzbekistan. More testimony is given by the fact that the criticism was investigated most thoroughly with employees of the CPSU Central Committee participating. The facts were confirmed.

Last week, the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee Bureau reviewed the results of checking out the critical statements by party member Zakhidov. A resolution was passed, which states, among other things:

"Taking into account the fact that Communist Comrade P. Khabibullayev admitted his lack of academic modesty and gave a self-critical assessment of his actions... [it is resolved] to limit discussion and consent to his own request to be reassigned to scientific work."

Well, it appears that the situation was resolved. However, all kinds of events took place between the statements by Marat Zakhidov and the meeting of the Central Committee Bureau—from the gathering of signatures of respected individuals in the republic "in defense of the president" to refined moral pressure on the "presumptuous" deputy secretary of the party committee. There even was a night attack on Marat by three persons unknown, which resulted in lacerations on his forehead.

The struggle of these weeks, invisible to those not on the inside, tells us yet again that the advocates of stagnation do not intend to restrict themselves to polemics from the rostrum alone.

Estonian People's Front-TASS Case Delayed

LD3101120689 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1700 GMT 17 Jan 89

[From the "Echo of the Day" program]

[Summary] Correspondent Neeme Brus says that the court hearing on the case of two TASS correspondents being sued by three members of the Estonian People's Front—Lauristin, Savisaar, and Koik—has been postponed for nearly a month. Edgar Savisaar's lawyer, (Ullar Talviste), says that legislation is liberal and allows for dragging out the process, and that the court has no right to discuss the matter in the absence of the defendants. He says that, in his experience, a civil case may take a year or even longer.

(Talviste) says: "With this case, it is not the matter of punishment which is at issue. It is that the case be examined as a civil case. What we aim to achieve is that the defendants relay to Moscow the same kind of information with the same means as they did the previous, incorrect information, and that they refute the incorrect claims that information includes. This means, I stress again, that this is not the case of punishing these people but reinstating the previous situation." The next hearing will take place on 16 February at 1000.

Readers Cite Lithuanian Language Problems

LD3101133089 Vilnius TIESA 15 Dec 88 p 1

[Letters-to-the-editor by readers Antanas Kubilius, Romanas Miliuskas, entitled: "Are We Rejoicing Too Soon?", "Concerning the Use of Patronymics in the Republic."]

[Text] Are We Rejoicing Too Soon?

Following the announcement that Lithuanian has been designated as the state language, joyful comments appeared in the press, noting the Lithuanian language has finally retrieved its rightful place in Lithuania. This joy is premature, to my way of thinking. From our life's experience we know how things turn out: the announcements read one way, but reality—becomes a totally different matter.

What sort of situation does exist now, particularly in Vilnius? Nearly all of the employees of Vilnius consumer services, trade, postal and telegraph, municipal services and other offices are non-Lithuanians. No, they are not newcomers, but people who have lived in Vilnius for 20 or more years, who have not as yet learned how to exchange greetings in Lithuanian. Will they wish to learn Lithuanian now?

I wish to make a point: it is necessary from the very onset, to stubbornly insist, in principle, that individuals, engaged in trade, services and health service areas, begin speaking in Lithuanian; those who do not know how to speak it, should start learning it; if they do not wish to learn, they should be replaced by individuals who can speak both Lithuanian and Russian. I wrote this down and cannot believe myself, the conclusion I came to. No one is going to enforce this, in principle, even though we now have a legal basis for it. Everything will remain as it was. After all, we already are convincing people in our press that a verbal or written question asked in an office, in Russian, will be answered in that same language. Certainly, that is the way it should be. But why is it that for some reason we fail to find (even in articles by officials), something to the effect that we will be answered in Lithuanian when we ask a question in Lithuanian. We are told just the opposite, foreigners have not yet learned Lithuanian and we cannot demand it all of a sudden etc. Thus, it is quite apparent, the Lithuanian language will remain in the stepdaughter's position in Lithuania. I realize my pessimistic thoughts are unfit to appear in a republic paper during these euphoric times; I only hope an editorial worker, having read these lines, while reading the exuberant letters from those rejoicing in the state language status, will correct a word or so, among the number which might be gushing with too much enthusiasm. This would be an accomplishment of sorts. Signed: Antanas Kubilius

Concerning the Use of Patronymics in the Republic

These remarks came into being following the appearance, in the press, of some proposals by readers and linguists who compared language and writing practices in Czechoslovakia, which I am somewhat acquainted with.

First, let us discuss Lithuanian patronymics. Many propose to do away with the addition, in Russian text, to Lithuanian names of the artificial "ovich, -evich, -ovna,-evna," and to replace them with Lithuanian genitive endings. Voices are heard (TIESA, 2 July 88), that it would be better to use the patronymic with the Russian genitive case and add "s," and "d", (son, daughter), such as, s. Petrasa, Jonasa. In my opinion, both of these constructions—first name, last name, (s, d.) father's name—are difficult to understand for foreigners and are clumsy for us to use.

As we are no doubt aware, the majority of the European countries, as well as the U.S., Canada and many other ocuntries, do not use the patronymic, in general. Let us open a passport, diploma, or drivers's licence of a Czech, German, Englishman or Norwegian, it contains the first and last names only. This is also done in Latin letters on Soviet passports abroad. In many countries, the father's name helps to identify an individual and protects him from being confused with others who have a common first and last name. In addition, in those countries, this usage also has traditions and also accomplishes an ethical function.

The Czechs and the Slovaks are considerably more numerous than we are, more than 15 million in number, but they are not experiencing any national confusion. In order to identify any individual, government offices are totally satisfied with using the date and place of birth, and place of residence, which appear on the passport. Also, we are not so numerous as to require to differentiate among our acquaintances and fellow countrymen according to patronymics. I propose, therefore, for us to follow the example of Czechoslovak SSR and other countries, and stop using patronymics in our writing altogether. It is totally sufficient to show the names of both parents on a birth certificate. In this manner we would avoid artificiality and clumsiness and would lighten our paperwork considerably.

And now, let us turn to another topic. The newly-begun REPUBLIC Renaissance is truly gritting on the ears of one who has been longing for the Lithuanian language. This word has acquired such might, that it now has become synonymous with country, Lithuania, a certain territory, or even association of residents. Its primary meaning, however, connotes a form of government, a country with a certain form of government. One wonders whether it really is necessary to underline everywhere, even in weather forecasts, that we are not a monarchy, but the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, or republic in abbreviated form. Radio broadcasting is especially abusive in this respect, employing: "In the Republic," "News from the Republic," "Republic News," "At the Rural Areas of the Republic," etc.

An individual who has some idea of what several historical battles by France, Czechoslovak Republics, and Spain for their republic status (?zhechpospolit), and the Lithuanian Republic were all about, may only marvel and try to guess at what they are accenuating. A Czech would not state that the weather is nice in his republic, i.e. Czechoslovakia, nor would he say that potatoes are being dug, or the republic is enjoying its leisure etc. It is a different matter to refer to the repubic parliament, president, administrative division, finances, economic accountability, etc. Even in this instance, it is worthwhile to learn from others moderation and accuracy. Signed: Romanas Miliauskas

***Disinformation About Lithuanian Movement Claimed**
WA18000452 Vilnius KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 22 Dec 88 p 2

[Article by G. Yefremov, literary scholar, member of the Sejm council of the Lithuanian Restructuring Movement: "Attempts at Incitement Are in Vain"]

[Text] I consider it my duty to respond to the article by L. Kapelyushnyy, "Movement and 'Stop Action'," published in the 329th issue of IZVESTIYA for 1988. I am convinced that this material needs to be supplemented and commented upon for otherwise millions of readers will be misinformed.

I am one of those whom the IZVESTIYA correspondent calls the leadership of the Movement, and therefore I can be reproached for a great deal, but not for being uninformed. I am not a Lithuanian, and therefore no matter how much you may want to, you cannot accuse me of national leanings. Finally, I have become accustomed to expressing and defending my own views of events and actions, no matter whose they may be. My understanding of various problems sometimes diverges from the opinions of other participants in the Lithuanian Restructuring Movement (which, incidentally, is more and more frequently being referred to in the central press by the Lithuanian word Sajudis without translation, which does not seem justified to me), and in this case I am speaking on my own behalf, without being authorized by anyone or being obligated to answer to anyone.

From all appearances, I am not included under the "wing of unrestrained radicals"; my position is closer to those who, to use L. Kapelyushnyy's words, tried to hear the "voice of reason" and who now are "being labeled from all sides." I do not accept and cannot accept as referring to myself the words of the IZVESTIYA correspondent concerning people "who comprise the pride of the Movement." Although like many others, I find gross flattery extremely nice. I cannot and will not believe compliments like this, for I can clearly distinguish the goal pursued by this far from irreproachable style of writing. The goal is obvious: to break up the Movement, to alienate its leaders from one another, to discredit some while placing others on a pedestal. I am convinced that attempts to sow dissension in our ranks are fruitless. All of us—and certainly not only the leadership of the Movement—sometimes end up in situations where we can be criticized, we work very hard to look for and find solutions that are acceptable to the majority, we make mistakes, and we go astray, but: we exist, and our hard-won, cherished unity achieved through much suffering will withstand this small test as well. This is not a matter of being offended by a correspondent whose work, in my view, is not very conscientious. The problem lies elsewhere: the very appearance of material like this shows the imminent cooling of the political climate, the possibilities of "restoration," of returning to the bad old days. You yourselves will be convinced: the article will be met with letters from workers who unanimously support and approve of the policy of the party and government and unequivocally condemn extremists, hooligans, and intriguers. Some time later we shall hear (and we shall see on the pages of the newspapers that are supposed to have been restructured) the labels nobody has forgotten like "anti-Soviet," "renegades," "cop-outs," and so forth and so on. A step has been taken in this direction. The "wrath of the people" which Lidiya Chukovskaya justly wrote about more than 15 years ago is now being renewed. Again the selection of letters is compiled in such a way that, lacking any exhaustive or objective information, the reader has drawn the only suggested conclusion: the people are not following the Sajudis leaders... Incidentally, this is not case... Consistently adhering to a policy of breaking up the Movement, L. Kapelyushnyy repeatedly includes a tested formula into the text: "CERTAIN LEADERS of Sajudis have lost the confidence of the people." But what people? The Lithuanian Restructuring Movement, naturally, is not the people: they make fun of the idea that "any cook could control the state." It is difficult to say what L. Kapelyushnyy wanted to accomplish by quoting this reader's letter, but this is the conclusion that emerges: a cook can control the state and, from all appearances, do just as good a job as our professional politicians, party leaders, and government... This is how such a quotation "works." In a word the Sajudis leadership are not the people. The sejm elected by the constituent congress is not the people. The delegates to the congress of the Lithuanian Restructuring Movement—1,100 people elected by the POPULATION OF THE ENTIRE TERRITORY (to use the jargon that is widespread in one of the central rayons of Moscow)—has nothing to do with the people. Those 250,000 who gathered on 23 August 1988 in Vingis Park could be counted so it turns out that the "up to 100,000"—these are not the people. The almost 2 million who signed to protest against the amendments and additions to the USSR Constitution—these are not the people either since more than 3.5 million people live in Lithuania. They are individual representatives of the public fabricated by the covert leadership of Sajudis or, rather, a part of this leadership. Such is the logic. If one follows this, it turns out that: the people are those who are disturbed by the behavior of the leaders of the Movement. And those individual deputies to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet who were elected unanimously during those well remembered moldy, dark, and stagnant years—I beg your pardon—are the only legitimate and worthy representatives of his highly aware and educated people. That is it precisely: these people who are longing for the past are the ones addressed by this article, it is written in their language, it reflects their hopes and customs, it glorifies them, and it is intended to instill in them the hope that the extreme manifestations of glasnost will somehow be accommodated within the already known framework. Let it be so. Everyone expresses his own opinion or the opinion of his group, of his leader or his client, of his grouping or his party—and make this his understanding of reality at his level.

But in addition to all the subjective aspects the article contains quite concrete distortions and omissions of very important events and phenomena. At the "best session" which the IZVESTIYA correspondent had occasion to see, in my opinion, attempts were made to find a nondemocratic solution to certain problems. This is what caused the disturbance of the crowd that had gathered next to the Palace of Soviets. "Hysterical shouts and insults" and, I shall add, spitting were directed mainly against members of the council of the sejm of the Lithuanian Restructuring Movement which as a sign of protest against procedural violations left the meeting hall and appeared on the square before the others did. It turns out that the leaders of the Movement arranged the spitting on themselves. Impressive, truly jesuitical insidiousness!

Both the context and the subtext of this composition create in the readers the impression that it was only through the efforts of the republic leadership—Party and Soviet—that the hymn, flag, and the status of the Lithuanian language as the official language were returned to the Lithuanian people. Hardly...

A serious threat that is worthy of attention is concealed in the words: "with whom will the Lithuanian people end up tomorrow? What will they eat and drink (this is said about the republic with the most developed agrarian sector!—G. Ye.), with what will they plow the land, what will they put in the gas tanks of the machinery, and how will they light the streets?" If this apparently rhetorical question is translated into plain language, this is what it means: we shall show you that with your sovereignty you will all die from cold and hunger! In light of all this, we must be concerned about the fate of rebellious Estonia. Before it is too late. If it is not already too late. Comrade L. Kapelyushnyy has made public the scenario for subduing the obstinate republic. Thank you for that.

It is with unconcealed revulsion that the IZVESTIYA correspondnet writes about the requirement for convening another session of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, the collection of signatures, the organization of pickets, and other protest actions, including an attempt at briefly halting city transportation. But what is so criminal, terrible, and impossible about all this? After all, these are days of freedom, the most ordinary social life, the manifestation of civic activity. Simple, normal, ordinary—but for a living, awakened, restored society. But for the majority of IZVESTIYA readers who know about real restructuring only from hearsay and can judge its manifestations only from articles like this—all this seems like a real nightmare. These are precisely the people who are being influenced by the central press agencies, who have been silent for a half year about people's movements in support of restructuring—and what a half year it has been! The most difficult, the most contradictory, in which support, advice, and parting words have been as necessary as the air we breathe! And now that anyone who feels like it has been given the opportunity to practice scoffing at and frightening peaceful residents and inciting all of us who have been broken have temporarily been left without their favorite work.

And the last thing: the only name L. Kapelyushnyy decided to make public was that of a professor at the conservatory, a music scholar, Vitautas Landsbergis. In the article he quotes a certain anonymous letter which contains the question: "why has the 'team of Professor Landsbergis' taken charge?" It is asserted that neither the professor himself nor the members of his so-called team have anything to do with the creation of the Restructuring Movement. This is an out-and-out lie.

I believe and sympathize with V. Landsbergis and I am ready to be accused of being a part of his team (although I had had occasion to actually speak with the professor himself only two or three times in my life), and I admit that I am not very close to those who "comprised the pride of the Movement." But for a fairly long time now I have had to work literally side by side with V. Landsbergis, the philosopher Romualdas Ozolas, the writers Sigitas Gyada, Yustinas Martsinkyavichyus and Martseliyus Martinaytis, the composers Yulyus Yuzelyunas and Osvaldas Balakauskas, the priest Vatslovas Alyulis, the architect Algimantas Nasvitis, the excavator operator Kazimeras Uoka, and other members of the council of the sejm of the Lithuanian Restructuring Movement. I do not know what to say in response to L. Kapelyushnyy who speaks about the "pride" as though it were something from the past. I think that these people are the pride of Lithuania. To try to pound a wedge between them and the rank-and-file participants in the Movement, the citizens of the restored Lithuania is a useless, if also a very profitable occupation these days.

P. S. For a long time I have tried unsuccessfully to publish this message in IZVESTIYA, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, and other central periodicals, and I have already been assured that my letter is hopelessly outdated. But then in IZVESTIYA No 349 there appeared another article by L. Kapelyushnyy entitled "Many Prophets, but the Truth..." I wish to add something to what has already been said. While accusing the Restructuring Movement of being intolerant of criticism, L. Kapelyushnyy seems to forget that his critical remarks are read by several million people while the total circulation of all Russian language newspapers of the Lithuanian Restructuring Movement is no more than 30,000. And any imprecision allowed by a correspondent of a central newspaper has a painful effect on anyone who is not indifferent to the fate of the republic.

'Sovereign' Lithuanian Journalists Union Set Up

LD3101113389 Vilnius in Lithuanian to North America 0100 GMT 29 Jan 89

[Summary] Correspondent Rima Jakutyte, reporting from the extraordinary conference of the Lithuanian Union of Journalists which concluded 28 January, said that a sovereign organization, the Lithuanian Union of Journalists was established at the conference.

One of the paragraphs of the union's statute reads that Lithuanian journalists pledge to defend the right of the citizens of Lithuania to prompt and objective information on events.

Relations with the USSR Union of Journalists and with the journalists' unions of other union republics are defined on the basis of agreement. The Lithuanian Union of Journalists will maintain direct contacts with foreign and international journalist organizations.

The chairman of the union's council was elected by the conference this time, and not appointed by the union council plenum.

Domas Sniukas, a PRAVDA correspondent for Lithuania, was elected chairman of the Lithuanian Union of Journalists Council, by a secret ballot from among two candidates. Numerous pressing problems were discussed at the conference, such as the absence of a press law or a censorship law. The latter is necessary since despite the process of democratization in the society today the Main Administration for the Protection of State Secrets in the Press [Glavlit] has become more active. Here is yet another oddity, since Glavlit will become a self-financing organization and publications therefore will have to pay Glavlit for being censored. Everybody failed to understand this.

The direction of the party bodies over the press also was discussed. In many cases, especially in the rayons, it is not a case of direction, it is direct control of the press.

Vezirov Addresses Azerbaijan Party Aktiv 13 Jan

PM3101103789 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 15 Jan 89 pp 1-2

[AZERINFORM report: "Common Concern and Common Responsibility; From Azerbaijan Party Aktiv Meeting"; for further reportage on the Azerbaijan party aktiv 13 January meeting, see the Political & Social section of the 17 January Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, p 52 and the 18 January Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, p 62]

[Excerpt] As has already been reported, a meeting of the republic's party aktiv was held in Baku 13 January. It discussed the tasks of the Azerbaijan party organizations in the light of the CPSU Central Committee instructions for normalizing the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and around it and the CPSU Central Committee election address to the party and the Soviet people. The aktiv meeting approved the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree on temporarily introducing a special form of administration in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast while preserving Nagorno-Karabakh's status as an autonomous oblast within the Azerbaijan SSR. The report and speeches emphasized that the most sensible and correct decision in the given situation had been taken and stressed that the Azerbaijan working people warmly support the principled course of the CPSU Central Committee toward overcoming tension and restoring the traditional ties of friendship and brotherhood between the two peoples.

A.Kh. Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, delivered a report.

In recent days, he said, there have been many very important political events which are of enormous importance for the fate of restructuring and the further consolidation of our multinational state. The CPSU Central Committee Plenum at which M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, delivered a report was held in Moscow 10 January.

This plenum has no analogies in the history of our party. Its agenda was the direct result of the positive processes which have developed in our country, of the democratization of Soviet society, and of the reform of the political system. Those taking part in the plenum unanimously supported the Central Committee Politburo proposal to nominate 100 candidate people's deputies of the USSR from the CPSU. They include the candidate from the Azerbaijan party organization, Guseyn Rustam ogly Ibragimov, born 1951, a driller from "Neftyanyye Kamni" and a member of the Baku party gorkom.

This was the first time that a CPSU Central Committee address "to the party and the Soviet people" was adopted at a Central Committee plenum.

The CPSU Central Committee addressed the Soviet people proceeding from the premise that the CPSU is the ruling party and therefore bears full responsibility to Soviet society for the destiny of socialism and the destiny of the country. Soviet people have the right to know the aims and tasks which the party is setting for the immediate future and what it is taking with it to the forthcoming elections.

The CPSU political platform expresses nationwide interests and unites all the multiplicity of opinions and needs of different strata of society.

The address assesses from realistic positions what has been achieved and the complexities of restructuring and sets out tasks in the sphere of domestic and foreign policy. The party has displayed great courage by assuming responsibility for the serious errors and blunders which have occurred in previous years. And at the same time, relying on Lenin's principles and proceeding from the people's interests, it has proposed an innovatory program for the renewal of socialism.

To strengthen the people's trust in the party, there is only one path—the development and deepening of the processes of restructuring and tireless concern for the growth of Soviet people's well being. That is the main content, the main motif of the Central Committee election address to the people.

The address will play all the greater a part the more thoroughly all party organizations explain and propagandize its content and rely on its fundamental ideas. That is why the address should be backed up by every necessary political and organizational measure.

The present elections have set new questions. Serious ideological work is needed to resolve them and this work must be launched extensively right now. Everyone must actively join in the election campaign and promote the successful holding of the elections on the basis of the principles which stem from our political reform.

I also want to inform you of the meeting held in Moscow between the leaders of the Azerbaijan SSR and the Armenian SSR. There was an examination of a broad range of questions connected with the normalization of the situation in the region. It was noted that the instability of the situation demands that both sides immediately take the most vigorous measures. The Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Bureau submitted specific proposals whose thrust is the coordination of actions with a view to normalizing interethnic relations and resurrecting the traditional ties and friendship between the two fraternal peoples. Comrade S.G. Arutyunyan fully supported them and we agreed on the elaboration of joint measures and created an interrepublican commission for the purpose.

A large place in the talk with our Armenian comrades was taken up by the problem of refugees, which in our view is the most urgent problem. The hope was voiced that this meeting will become a good example for the leaders of party, soviet, and economic organs and public organizations in the two republics to set up contacts at the most diverse levels. The situation in the region and ways of regulating the interethnic conflict and restoring peace and calm were the focus of the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and a group of deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet from the Azerbaijan SSR and Armenian SSR.

The frank, principled exchange of opinions made it possible to elaborate a program of practical measures to break the course of events and normalize the situation.

On 12 January the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium thoroughly examined the question connected with the situation which has taken shape in and around Nagorno-Karabakh and heard reports on this question from the first secretaries of the Central Committees of the Azerbaijan and Armenian Communist Parties. Taking into account the proposals of the two republics' party and state organs and of the Soviet of Nationalities commission and having examined this question with the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, with a view to preventing the further aggravation of interethnic relations in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and stabilizing the situation in this region, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, in accordance with the USSR Constitution, has temporarily introduced in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast a special form of administration while retaining Nagorno-Karabakh's status as an autonomous oblast within the Azerbaijan SSR.

Having stressed the importance of the steps which have been taken and which have enormous political significance, Comrade Vezirov notified the meeting's participants of the main content of the talks and discussions held in Moscow.

We reported to the country's leadership that as a result of the steps taken to overcome the interethnic conflict we have succeeded in ensuring a breakthrough in public sentiment and retaining control over the situation, he said. The majority of the republic's workers denounced nationalist extremist slogans and manifestations and supported the CPSU Central Committee's principled course to overcome the crisis situation. Many labor collectives have worked days off at their own initiative, lengthened their shifts, and covered a substantial proportion of the loss caused by failure to turn up for work. Considerable amounts of money were put into the fund for aid for the victims of the Armenian earthquake fund.

It was noted that the 18 July 1988 USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium session and the resolution it adopted have become turning points in the development of events in the region. The results of the session and M.S. Gorbachev's speech at it were welcomed with satisfaction by the republic's Communists and working people and formed the basis of all our practical activity to regulate interethnic relations.

Speaking of the special attention which is paid to the fulfillment of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution on accelerating the socioeconomic development of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, Comrade Vezirov reported on what has been done and noted that the volume of capital investments for 1989 for the territory of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast will almost double compared to last year's plan.

All this is to our credit. But nonetheless the situation in the region is far from having stabilized yet. I should like in this connection, comrades, to draw your attention most seriously to the article "Serving the True Interests of the People" published in the republican newspapers and reprinted in PRAVDA. We have been told that it has even been reprinted by Georgian and Uzbek newspapers. The article's analysis, premises and conclusions, and principled assessments of the actions of circles seeking to delay restructuring are very important for an understanding of events and their causes and consequences.

The antirestructuring forces in the two republics and the leaders of the "Karabakh" and "Krunk" committees which, although they have been disbanded, continue to operate actively, and the dealers of the shadow economy continue to fuel and exploit interethnic enmity and the

Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast problem for their own selfish purposes. Of course, we have brought pressure to bear on them but unfortunately we have not barred their influence from the consciousness of thousands of people. And that is fraught with the danger that these people will be involved in new illegal actions.

The actions of extremist nationalists from the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast continue to be the nutrient medium for extremist sentiments in Azerbaijan. The ostentatious withdrawals of the Nagorno-Karabakh party obkom, the Komsomol obkom, the oblast trade unions council, and the oblast potrebsoyuz from the republican structure were taken particularly keenly.

Some elements, including some in our republic, see these arbitrary actions as an opportunity for the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast's secession from the Azerbaijan SSR. Especially as this is all taking place against the background of constant calls from the oblast leadership for union with Armenia or the RSFSR.

We shall continue resolutely to halt the illegal activity of corrupt antirestructuring forces. That accords with the population's insistent demands that the force of the law be used to the full.

The demonstrations by the republic's working people in favor of the active pursuit of a line toward restructuring, the demands that violations of the territorial integrity of the Azerbaijan SSR be forbidden, the provocative actions of the extremists in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and also the growth of national self awareness have been cunningly exploited by corrupt forces. In a number of places they have been able to channel the working people's dissatisfaction into destabilizing the situation.

We know who issued the instructions for food, blankets, and tents to be supplied from bread combines, refrigerated stores, kebab stalls, and depots for the participants in the unsanctioned meetings. Moreover, the organizers of the night time rallies on the square were given hundreds of thousands of rubles, including rubles stolen from the state and various cooperative organizations. The investigation groups has specific information about the people who poured oil on the fire. Tens of thousands of illegally collected rubles have already been confiscated.

We even have in our possession special accounts books recording sums of money and the passport data of those who gave money and the names of the organizations where it was collected. Copies of these documents are in the possession of the party raykoms and we hope in the very near future to hear what steps have been taken against these people. This scum did everything to muddy the waters, to work up the people, to distract the party, soviet, and law enforcement organs from the cleansing processes which have begun in the republic.

Unfortunately, not all leading cadres were up to the mark in this situation and some of them were led by the crowd and were themselves the organizers of disturbances.

On the eve of the meeting Comrade G.N. Seidov, chairman of the Council of Ministers, sent a note saying that in the period of the crisis events there had been instances of the disruption of the working rhythm and attempts to disorganize the collective's work at the Azerbaijan SSR State Committee for Statistics. I can say that on one of those days the most active participants in an unsanctioned demonstration at the Communist Party Central Committee building were indeed the workers of the State Committee for Statistics. They spread absurd rumors and kindled unhealthy passions and emotions. And in this situation the committee leaders stood idle and did not lift a finger.

State committee chairman Kh. M. Mamedov is a candidate member of the Central Committee. How could he tolerate the fact that in the organization he heads a situation had taken shape in which 20 Armenians who worked here were forced to resign under the influence of panic-mongering rumors?

Moreover, deputy chairmen Comrades Veliyev and Gadzhiyev, displaying political short-sightedness, signed a letter asking for the repeal of Baku Soviet deputy Comrade Ayrapetov and his release from his post. How are we to understand these actions? What is this—open resistance to restructuring and to our party's line? Or did they want the entire republic to go up in flames, did they want bloodshed?

The republic's Council of Ministers intends to support the decision of the Oktyabrskiy party Raykom on the inexpediency of retaining them in their posts.

At the same time the question legitimately arises: Why did the Council of Ministers react so late to this fact, which had been indicated a month ago in the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat resolution? This temporizing stance is incomprehensible.

It must be said that many leading cadres were very adroit in concealing their idleness or inability to work by citing the difficulties which had arisen in interethnic relations. When people asked the city leaders why particular foodstuffs were not on sale, they would hear in reply about the difficulties of the Gosagroprom. Yet at the same time for some reason the militia was unable to halt the influx of stolen food to the square. Incidentally, all the food confiscated had been stolen from the state, including from hospitals and kindergartens.

It is too early for us to speak of definitive conclusions. But even now we can speak of the profound degree to which whole sectors of the national economy and their leaders have been affected by bribery, embezzlements, and exaggerated reports. This applies primarily to the

agro-industrial complex, particularly the food industry. Much is coming to light in the construction organizations, trade, national education, and health care.

Recently a trade worker—a major underground figure who carried great weight in his milieu in Baku—repented and made frank confessions as to who was active where and how. All this has been passed on to the prosecutor's office and the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Party Control Commission.

A document which an honest Communist had managed to retain was passed on to this commission recently. A few years ago a criminal investigation into a den of vice, into procuring, was begun—and high ranking workers, including some recently expelled from the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, underwent this investigation. But on instructions from the then Central Committee first secretary, these people's evidence was withdrawn. Some of them soon became heroes of socialist labor. I was told how suitcases and boxes were hastily removed from the apartment of one of the people expelled from the Central Committee. They were obviously seriously frightened that their sins would surface.

The activity of the controlling organs gives rise to serious reprimands. These organs were keenly criticized at the Baku party conference. It is no longer a secret that many workers of the law enforcement organs have joined with criminal elements and use their official position for selfish purposes.

Serious cadres reshuffling has taken place recently in these organs, particularly the KGB and MVD. This work is continuing. But, unfortunately, the leaders of the republic's prosecutor's office and Supreme Court are still timid in this important matter.

Many of the republic's former leaders were as they say kept by the mafia and linked to it by deals and a venal apparatus. The present leaders and all our cadres must behave extraordinarily vigilantly, use all existing experience, display political courage, and, where necessary, swim against the current and not adapt to the loudmouths or fear the crowd's taunts.

Measures to punish those who allowed discrimination and persecution against people for national reasons and other violations of constitutional rights are meeting with support everywhere. Many personnel changes have been carried out in the republic and new cadres have been promoted. This work has met with the support of the CPSU Central Committee leadership. Over the past month 2,532 people, including 612 leaders, have been called to account through party and administrative channels, 222 people have been dismissed, and 65 people have been expelled from the CPSU and the Komsomol.

In this connection I should like to say that, on meeting with the Armenian SSR leadership, we were obliged to note that the antirestructuring forces and corrupt clans often operate in closer contact and more harmoniously than do we, the leaders of the two republics.

From this viewpoint the meeting between the Azerbaijan and Armenian leadership was of fundamental importance not only for demonstrating our unswerving resolve to proceed along the path of overcoming objective and subjective reasons for interethnic hostility. It was also and perhaps chiefly important for the fact that it is only by joint actions that the most complex national questions can be resolved. Alone, neither we nor the Armenian comrades can untie the tight knot or cut it. We are strong when we are together.

National building based on justice and socialist acquisitions and values is our common concern and responsibility. It will make no headway if we act in isolation, only for our own republic, only for our own people, especially when it is to the detriment of others. Success lies in cooperation, in the combination of the interests of each nation and ethnic group, in balancing the interests of each republic and, unfailingly, of our entire country.

It seems to me the most important thing today is to coordinate positions, to elaborate the concept of interethnic conciliation on the basis of M.S. Gorbachev's fundamental directives and well known party and government documents. In our view this concept should include an integral program for the normalization and development of Azerbaijani-Armenian relations both at an interrepublican level and within each republic. We must proceed from a profound awareness of the complete futility of any forms of interethnic confrontation and mutual accusations, especially claims and endless attempts to ascertain who is right and who is in the wrong.

The past 11 months have shown that not a single vitally important question has been or can be resolved by this means. The whole world is witness to what the raising, in an extreme form, of the issue of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast's territorial allegiance has brought and how much grief and suffering has been the lot of thousands of totally innocent people.

The principles of the concept of interethnic conciliation, developed and transferred to a practical plane, could make up a detailed program of joint constructive actions. In that case it is very important to seek nonstandard, mutually acceptable solutions and to proceed along the path of the new thinking.

Of course, you cannot normalize relations in one session. Many years of strenuous work lie ahead. But there are problems which can and unfailingly must be resolved immediately.

The fate of the refugees and their return to their places of permanent residence is particularly important at the present stage for the normalization of interethnic relations—and we placed particular emphasis on this in our speeches in Moscow. Refugees and the fact that they are unsettled are a source of the conservation of tension in the two republics. We are witnessing the skillful way in which political adventurists are playing on the tragedy of these people.

Comrade Vezirov reported that over 19,000 Armenians have already returned to the republic and the return of Azerbaijani families to Armenia has also begun. This must be encouraged by every means.

Something else is also known: People have lost their faith in promises and appeals. That is why we agreed to back up the joint appeal of the Communist Party Central Committees, Supreme Soviet Presidiums, and Councils of Ministers of Azerbaijan and Armenia with active steps and measures by all our party, soviet, and economic organs. After all it is a case of the destiny of nearly 250,000 citizens of both republics. This question was comprehensively examined at an expanded session of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Bureau. We agreed with the Armenian SSR leadership to ensure reliable guarantees of safety, the return of refugees to their homes, the restoration of their lawful rights, and the compensation of material losses. Comrade F.T. Sarkisyan, chairman of the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers, assured us that steps would be taken to release all illegally occupied apartments and houses abandoned by Azerbaijani families.

The process of people's return should be helped by regular meetings between leaders of the cities and rayons which Azerbaijani and Armenian families have left. We asked the Armenian leadership to give every attention and assistance to setting up and expanding contacts between leaders of neighboring rayons. Experience shows how useful this is. I was convinced of this while visiting Zangelan and Kubatly. We saw how actively the party raykoms here work with the leadership of neighboring rayons. There are also good results in other rayons, for instance in Kazakh, Tauz, Shamkhor, Dashkesan, and a number of others. The comrades are working without stinting their efforts and the results are not bad.

Paramount tasks include the unconditional fulfillment of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions for our republics on measures to ensure the operation of vitally important industrial and transport establishment, on the very flagrant violations of citizens' constitutional rights, and on the impermissibility of actions by individual officials in local organs compelling citizens to leave their places of permanent residence.

In the very near future we and the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee must, in conjunction with the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee, report to the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat on how people have reacted to officials' illegal actions in this period.

Mention has already been made of the fact that a large sum of money has been taken and confiscated from Iskenderov, first secretary of the Kedabekskiy party raykom. An investigation is now under way.

The USSR Prosecutor's Office has also instituted criminal proceedings with regard to other instances. As for Alekperov, chief of the Kedabekskiy Rayispolkom organizational department, who collected money for those taking part in the meetings in Baku, he has been expelled from the party and dismissed from work.

Special importance at the present stage attaches to a resolute struggle against rumors and fabrications and malicious misinformation. It is essential to do everything to refrain from unhealthy polemics. We will unconditionally monitor the activity of the mass media to ensure that every publication and broadcast works to normalize the situation in the region. In this work we must be strictly guided by the relevant Central Committee Bureau resolution.

We should also be concerned to ensure that our newspapers start to publish items on life in neighboring republics and to organize joint items on topical issues in the central press and on all-union radio and television.

As a whole we should consistently and persistently follow Lenin's norms and principles of nationalities policy and struggle resolutely against those trying to destabilize the situation and pushing people to illegal actions. The principles of justice and fraternal mutual aid, which ensure the overall upsurge and improvement of the working people's economic and social living conditions, should become a reliable guideline in normalizing interethnic relations.

I must say that our country's leadership assesses highly the internationalism of our republic's working people and the way in which they responded wholeheartedly to the calamity which befell the land of Armenia, to the terrible tragedy which happened in the fraternal republic.

Our duty is to do everything to develop and build up these traditions, to ensure a fundamental breakthrough in ideological and all mass political work. Special mention must be made of the forms of this work. We recommend that not only gatherings and meetings but also, for instance, rural rallies be held and that more attention be paid to individual talks.

In brief, talking heart to heart with people, talking frankly—that is the only way in which you can win their trust and lead them.

I remember that at the Baku conference I said that I had once asked the party committee secretary of a large enterprise whether he managed to feel at home with the Communists. Some time later I put the same question to the plant's director and I realized the situation had not changed. But the comrades gave their word that this time they would rectify their errors. And today I am satisfied that the promise has been kept.

In saying this I want to stress yet again that the party workers knew people's mood well, lived by their concerns and problems, and were able to give intelligent answers to the questions perturbing them and to resolve them.

The problem of Nagorno-Karabakh occupied a large place during the talks and meetings in Moscow.

In preparing for it and for the session of the commission headed by M.S. Gorbachev, we sought different approaches and options for settling the conflict. That was how the joint address from the leadership of the two republics to the refugees was born. We sent the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau our proposals on the concept of interethnic conciliation. We well understood that it is necessary to seek solutions on a sensible basis.

In the summer of last year the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium approved Comrade A.I. Volskiy as their representative in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. This was undoubtedly a useful action. Much has been done. But the representative's opportunities have not been fully used because of the limited nature of his powers and, the main thing, because of the overt resistance from corrupt and nationalist elements in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

Nonetheless it may be considered that the correct direction for a compromise was arrived at. But life has shown that we must go further. This was demanded in their addresses by the republic's working people who, at meetings in labor collectives, at party and workers' gatherings, and assemblies frequently raised questions as to when order would be introduced in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

Proceeding from the premise that the continuation of the very dangerous actions by the leading organs of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast is fraught with the danger of even greater calamities and in connection with the need to put an end to the harmful activity of officials with regard to people of the other nationality, we deemed it necessary to raise the question of taking extraordinary steps to restore public order, social legality, and people's social protection, and, finally, to normalize the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. We can no longer tolerate a situation where a substantial proportion of the autonomous oblast's cadres have acted as organizers of illegal actions.

We will not tolerate this, inasmuch as we all bear responsibility for the fate of our state and for ensuring the irreversibility of restructuring.

This purpose is undoubtedly served by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree on introducing a special form of administration in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast of the Azerbaijan SSR. I must say that the party and state leadership supported our ideas reflected in this document as to the temporary nature of this measure. After all, the forces seeking confrontation have done everything to implant and are now propagandizing the idea that the oblast's subordination to union organs is the intermediate stage on the path to the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast's secession from the Azerbaijan SSR. That is why the decree also particularly emphasizes the unshakability of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast's territorial allegiance. The special administration committee will work in close contact and in interaction with our republic's leadership.

The need for this committee is determined by the fact that the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast leadership is shamelessly steering a politically harmful, frankly nationalist line which has already caused enormous damage to the cause of restructuring, the oblast's development, and people's moral health. It deserves a strict party assessment and dismissals. We also raised the question of carrying out within a convenient time the political certification of each Communist in the oblast party organization.

And let no one try to accuse us of seeking strong-arm methods. It is a case of everyone having to subordinate themselves to the demands of the CPSU decree and to bear personal responsibility to the law.

We also say this because we are informed of the designs which are being nurtured by certain forces in Azerbaijan against everything which is being done on the path of renewing life. We spoke of this frankly recently at the Baku party conference, whose work has been reported in detail in the press and on television. We know that even beyond our region there are many people who are trying to use the events in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast for antirestructuring purposes.

Comrades tell me that in some places all kinds of addresses, programs, and leaflets are appearing. To the question of their provenance the reply is that they have as a rule been rewritten from documents of the Estonian

People's Front arriving via Yerevan. But the main thing is that all this has nothing in common with true concern and a high degree of responsibility for the destiny of one's people.

Dwelling next on the provisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree, Comrade Vezirov stressed that all the measures which are being implemented in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast will be carried out in collaboration with and with an unfailing consideration for the opinion of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and other republican organs.

The special administration committee will resolve tasks to normalize the sociopolitical situation in the oblast, to ensure exemplary order and citizens' safety, and to fulfill unconditionally the party and government resolutions on the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

Priority tasks include the return to their homes of the Azerbaijani families compelled to leave the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, employment for dismissed people, and an extensive program for the provision of amenities for the villages., In brief, we will do everything to ensure that people live as Soviet people should live on Soviet land.

In this connection A.Kh. Vezirov dwelled in particular on the tasks of the party and soviet organs of the rayons which are neighbors of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast to render every aid and assistance to the committee in work to restore normal life in the autonomous oblast.

And here is the thought with which I should like to end my speech. Everyone must assume far greater responsibility and thus relieve the center of concerns connected with interethnic conflict in the region. There is no doubt that the republican party organization and all our cadres will augment their efforts for the speediest solution of questions of vitally important significance for our multinational state and for the destiny of restructuring and Soviet society's revolutionary renewal. [passage omitted]

'No Miracles' Foreseen for NKAO Committee

PM3101142389 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jan 89 p 1

[Special correspondent V. Panov report: "How Are Things in Stepanakert?"]

[Text] Stepanakert—I cannot answer this question in one word. Enterprises and public transportation are working and the stores are open. In the evening young people, as everywhere, take a walk around the streets of this cozy little town. But on the same streets you continually meet military and militia patrols and combat equipment, which do not go very well with notions of a peaceful life.

A night curfew operates in the city. Refugees fret in the "Karabakh" Hotel, unaccustomed to the way of life. There is movement around the Nagorno-Karabakh party obkom building. The oblast special administration committee—an unusual organ of power for us—is working virtually around the clock here.

I am following in my colleagues' footsteps. Several months ago KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA wrote about the autonomous oblast's biggest enterprise—the Karabakh silk combine named for the 26 Baku commissars who, alas, some people are now trying to call simply "the commissars." How are things in the combine today?

Everyone is working at the combine today, but they are also talking—talking incessantly. They are talking about how last year's sad events started. This complex knot—a psychological one—still needs to be unraveled. And it is no simpler, it seems, than the economic, social, and many other knots.

A difficult meeting was under way in the office of combine director R.Ye. Atayan. It is essential to build up an intensive working rhythm, the director was insisting. And the leaders, who were sitting round the large table, at times were fired up with the director's conviction, and at other times suddenly began to sigh and seemed to flag: "If only the workers turn up."

The enterprise's difficult economic situation had anyway deteriorated recently. Instability and strikes disrupted the rhythm and broke ties with suppliers. Hopes for the reconstruction under way at the combine, for economic accountability, self-financing, and restructuring's other economic realities, were in jeopardy. The effect of the expulsion of Azerbaijani workers from the collective is painfully apparent. There were several hundred of them. The prosecutor's office has many complaints in this connection against the leadership, and against the enterprise collective. Incidentally, the people brought it on themselves. Earlier, the processing of silkworm cocoons into raw silk and natural silk production contributed significantly to the combine's profit. The Azerbaijani workers did this work as a fine national tradition. A significant amount of the raw material came from Azerbaijan SSR territory, although there were also complaints about its quality. Now there are no Azerbaijanis at the enterprise, and deliveries are in jeopardy.

There was a time when virtually all the autonomous oblast's political and social organizations, giving in to emotions, failing to show political maturity, and unable to bring themselves to swim against the tide, were determined in one form or another to take steps to escape from republican jurisdiction.

The special form of administration—the committee led by A.I. Volskiy—is meant to lower the emotional temperature, eliminate distortion, put everyone in their places, and open the way for healthy forces. I have to disappoint those who think that the committee will

accomplish its task quickly. There are no miracles. But the committee immediately set to work. It is faced with a mass of problems: social, economic, psychological, ecological, and many others. A mass of organizational, technical and other difficulties.

At around 8 pm I was in the reception room of V.M. Mishin, committee member and secretary of the AUCCTU, who was leading the reception session. Viktor Maksimovich got to the essence of the problem and took decisions immediately.

Not only mixing with people, but going out to their work place have become the norm for committee members.

'Exact' Tajik Quake Death Toll, Aid Efforts Noted

PM3101105989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by own correspondent A. Karpov: "Tajikistan: Emergency Commission in Operation"]

[Text] A conference was held on 26 January at the Tajik Council of Ministers under the direction of USSR Council of Ministers Deputy Chairman G.G. Vedernikov. It discussed questions connected with work to eliminate the aftermath of the Gissar earthquake. It was noted that the zone of the tremors, exceeding Force 5-6, covered an area of more than 2,100 square km. As has been reported, Gissarskiy Rayon was at the epicenter of the earthquake and was particularly badly hit. The strength of the earthquake there was force 7, which caused a massive landslip that hit the villages of Sharor, Okuli-Poyen, and Okuli-Bolo. Dozens of houses, administrative and social facilities, and livestock-raising premises were buried beneath a layer of earth many meters thick. Some 3,000 families were made homeless...

According to the preliminary data published during the first 24 hours after the earthquake, there were 1,000 casualties. The figure was subsequently revised. It turned out to be more than three times too high. The exact figures are as follows: 274 people were killed. Of the 73 people hospitalized 17 have already been discharged in a satisfactory condition; 56 of the victims are in the care of skilled doctors from Dushanbe or Moscow.

Tajik Council of Ministers Chairman I. Khayeyev, head of the emergency commission, reported that the republic government has paid R300,000 in lump sums to the inhabitants of destroyed villages. More than 100 mobile accommodation units, 260 yurts, and dozens of large, heated tents have arrived in the disaster area. A large proportion of the inhabitants has been housed in the surviving administrativwe buildings and in relatives' homes. But this is still not enough. A large quantity of temporary housing for the victims is continuing to arrive from Uzbekistan and Kirghizia.

It was stressed at the conference that, in addition to providing people in the disaster zone with temporary housing, active preparations are being made for the construction of major new settlements and a range of sociocultural and consumer facilities in Gissarskiy Rayon. According to preliminary estimates, it will require over R150 million to eliminate the aftermath of the disaster.

G.G. Vedernikov addressed the conference, saying, in particular: All the problems will be tackled on a joint basis, by the whole country. The grief of the Tajik people is the common grief of all Soviet people.

The government of Tajikistan has been given 10 days to prepare a draft resolution on measures to eliminate the aftermath of the Gissar earthquake.

Belorussian Central Committee Releases Kolokolov

LD1901002789 Minsk ZVYAZDA in Belorussian 31 Dec 88 p 1

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] An organizational question was dealt with at a plenum of the Communist Party of Belorussia Central Committee, held in Minsk yesterday.

The plenum released Comrade Yu.B. Kolokolov from the post of secretary and member of the bureau of the Communist Party of Belorussia Central Committee in connection with his retirement on pension owing to his state of health.

The plenum expressed gratitude to Yu. Kolokolov for his long and fruitful work in the republic's party organization. [passage omitted]

Popularity of Stalin, Khrushchev, Brezhnev Polled

LD3101114689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1112 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow, 31 Jan (TASS)—Participants in a poll staged in the capital of the USSR have been able to express their attitude to the political and state leaders who have been in charge of the USSR at various stages of the country's history. One thousand Muscovites answered a questionnaire which included the names of Joseph Stalin, Nikita Khrushchev, and Leonid Brezhnev. The telephone poll was organized by the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociology and the U.S. firms (?Martila and Kylie) and Market Opinion Research in December last year.

A negative appraisal was given to Joseph Stalin by 65 percent of those asked, and a positive one by 10 percent. The remainder had no definite opinion or had difficulty answering. In the opinion of sociologists, the predominantly negative attitude toward Stalin is connected with the fact that the truth about mass repression and other illegalities in the period when he led the country have come to light in the last 3 years. Public opinion also

connects with Stalin's rule the formation of the command-administrative system of administration, throwbacks to which have still not been eradicated and are having a pernicious effect in all spheres of the life of society.

As the poll showed, Nikita Khrushchev is quite popular in the country. His name is connected with the bold exposure of the crimes of Stalin's time, and also with the attempts to carry out socioeconomic reforms, even though they were not fully successful. A positive appraisal was given to Khrushchev by 51 percent of those taking part in the survey, and a negative one by 12 percent. The remainder gave no definite answer.

Leonid Brezhnev, who bears no small share of the responsibility for the fact that the Soviet Union went through a period of stagnation in the 1970's and early 1980's, is extremely unpopular. He got a positive appraisal from only 7 percent of those polled, and a negative one from 64 percent. The remainder could not give a precise formulation of the attitude to Brezhnev.

Commentary on Andreyeva Interview With U.S. Daily
LD3101112889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2000 GMT 30 Jan 89

[From "The World Today" program presented by Vladimir Tsvetov]

[Text] The Leningrad chemistry teacher Nina Andreyeva has again told the world that she cannot forego her principles. This time she has used the pages of THE NEW YORK TIMES for this purpose. Andreyeva has again set out—in an adapted form, it is true—those same old anti-restructuring principles which are dear to her which are well known to us from the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA newspaper. A just appraisal has already been given to the truth of these principles, and I have no need to repeat them. I will merely dwell on the new motives of the principle in Andreyeva's abundant creativity. Listen to what she told THE NEW YORK TIMES correspondent:

The present rehabilitation of the majority of those who were convicted during the Moscow trials in the thirties generates more questions among people than it presents convincing proof of the correctness of the decisions on rehabilitation. Andreyeva continues: Many people are puzzled; how it could happen that, during the period of terror and lawlessness political trials were held openly, whereas now, in the period of democracy, glasnost and openness, the question of rehabilitation is being decided in camera, away from the public and correspondents?

One remembers Maksim Gorkiy who once had this timely thought: One should provide as much freedom of speech as possible, for when our enemies talk a lot, in the long run they talk nonsense. That is very useful. The nonsense uttered by Andreyeva is clear to us, but it is by no means clear to the readers of THE NEW YORK TIMES. For they do not know, for example, that in the materials of the investigation and the trial in the case of the so-called 'anti-Soviet right-wing Trotskyite bloc,' which took place—as Andreyeva told the U.S. people—in a truly open manner in 1938, there is, for example, the evidence of Pletnev, a professor of the Institute of Functional Diagnostics. He quoted the words of his investigator: If the supreme governing body supposes that you are guilty, then even if you were 100 percent right, you will be guilty. The supreme governing body in the person of Stalin supposed, naturally, that Pletnev was guilty, and the professor's 100 percent innocence did not save him from a sentence of 20 years in a labor camp. Just as it failed to save Pletnev's colleagues on trial with him—Bukharin and Rykov—and all those who spent the Moscow trials and other political courts of law in the dock in the Stalin period.

Judging from the interview, that is the sort of openness of the trial which impresses Andreyeva so much. Andreyeva hopes that Americans will believe her in something else, too—that the rehabilitation of the innocent victims of the period of Stalin will not be held in a democratic way. Probably not many of THE NEW YORK TIMES' readers are aware that a study of the materials connected with the repressions which occurred in the period of the thirties, the forties, and the beginning of the fifties is being carried out by a commission which comprises three members and two candidate-members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the Party Control Commission chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Commission, and that the USSR procurator general, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Court and a large group of historical scientists and lawyers are taking part in the commission's work. The results of the commission's work are constantly covered in the newspapers, and with the publication of the monthly NEWS OF THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE the opportunity has arisen to describe the commission's work in more detail.

Andreyeva told THE NEW YORK TIMES correspondent that the majority of those who were condemned by Stalin's courts—and, one may suppose, by the three-man commissions, too—were in no way guiltless. Andreyeva heaped this monstrous slander even on her relative, who was also in the camps. It may be that Andreyeva has in mind the confessions of the defendants.

Insofar as I began to cite the materials of the trial on the case of the anti-Soviet right-wing Trotskyite bloc, I shall refer to it again, and also refer to Professor Pletnev's evidence: By force and deceit I was compelled to make a confession. Interrogations for 15-18 hours straight, forced sleeplessness, squeezing of the throat, and threats of beatings led to my losing my senses, when I could not give a clear report about what I had done. Hundreds of such testimonies have already been quoted in the Soviet press.

Andreyeva did not fail to enlighten THE NEW YORK TIMES readers as to who those people were who, using Andreyeva's language, are performing moral-political

striptease by opposing her views. They are—I am quoting Andreyeva—the cultural elite who are using anti-Stalin emotions as a shield to attack the most important principles of Leninism and the Communist Party.

Andreyeva's task is clear—to try to convince the U.S. public that restructuring is being carried out by people in whom one cannot believe. In her interview to THE NEW YORK TIMES, Andreyeva listed close and distant relatives who had given their lives for the establishment of Soviet power: Their baton has now passed to me. Andreyeva said this without excessive modesty. I believe, however, that if those heroic people were alive today they would scarcely hand over to Andreyeva the bright and clear symbol—the baton of the revolution.

Displays of 'Intolerance' by Literati Criticized

PM3101160789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Jan 89 Second Edition p 1

["Editorial Opinion": "In the Name of Consolidation"]

[Text] The revolutionary changes brought to life by restructuring would be impossible without a revolution in social awareness, in people's psychology and thinking. And, it was said at the meeting with scientific and cultural figures in the CPSU Central Committee on 6 January this year, the unique role of our scientific and artistic intelligentsia is indispensable here. Its huge contribution to restructuring and to the creation of a new moral and political atmosphere in our society is universally recognized. This role will grow in the future.

This is why it is important and necessary today to have responsibility in opinions, to conduct civilized debate, to decisively reject cliquishness, malevolence and bitterness, and to consolidate forces on a principled basis, in the interests of restructuring.

Judging by the editorial mailbag, the call heard at the meeting to discard ambition, to think about the people and the country, is understood and approved. The party, the authors of letters to PRAVDA note, respects the labor of writers, scholars, and scientific and cultural figures, is direct and honest toward their position, and supports fruitful discussions. These are the kind of discussions that make it possible to more fully identify and take into account public opinion and the interests of diverse strata of society, to support everything new and advanced that is coming into our lives with restructuring, and also to note negative phenomena and mistakes and prevent them from spreading.

It is all the more distressing that even now certain articles by famous masters of literature and art are spattered with mutual insults and show intolerance of others' opinions and settling of scores. This has absolutely nothing to do with genuine pluralism of opinions, and it makes people perplexed and indignant.

The letter from M. Alekseyev, V. Astafyev, V. Belov, S. Bondarchuk, S. Vikulov, P. Proskurin, and V. Rasputin caused an outcry among readers. Among the responses to it, which were varied in their assessments (telegrams, short and detailed letters) was an appeal to the newspaper from a group of writers: V. Bykov, B. Vasilyev, A. Voznesenskiy, D. Granin, I. Drutse, V. Dudintsev, Ye. Yevtushenko, F. Iskander, B. Okudzhava, and A. Pristavkin. Both the content, and the biting—in their view—form of the publication, and the shallowness of their assertions evoked a sharp protest from them.

"Restructuring," the authors write, "must be above personal ambitions and group interests." One cannot fail to agree with this position, and indeed with the proposal to conduct literary polemics honestly and in a principled fashion, respecting one's colleagues, and without resorting to unscrupulous methods.

I think it fruitless to develop further discussion on these questions, especially to stir up a collection of mutual grievances. The editorial board is right behind those who advocate creative competition among literary and artistic figures—at the writer's table, on the stage, or on the movie set. Right behind those who quite rightly believe that the inflaming of passions, intolerance, and mutual malevolence are intolerable. Right behind those who advocate consolidation. No, not at any price, but by adherence to the policy of restructuring, on the basis of our socialist values.

Tolerance, an ability to listen to an opponent and to understand his arguments are the indispensable characteristics of civilized discussions, and of socialist pluralism of opinions. No one has a monopoly on the truth. "People who always want to be right are awful," Lev Tolstoy wrote in his "Diaries." "They are ready to condemn the innocent, the saints, and God himself for the sake of being right."

One cannot fail to be upset if this intolerance sets the tone in newspaper-journal and public rows—if the interests of the common cause are left out and recede before someone's desire to hurt, to humiliate, and to strike out what positive things have been done by others, in the polemical fervor to ascribe to them sins which do not exist. All this cannot fail to undermine the prestige of the writer and the cultural figure valued by the people, from whom they expect wise words helping creative work, to elevate the individual, and our society's spiritual renewal. The poet was right when he wrote: "...Writing is also work, as Lenin often repeated."

Kazakh Writer Urges Input on Plenum on Ethnic Ties

PM3101150589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
27 Jan 89 Second Edition p 4

[PRAVDA correspondent G. Dildyayev interview with writer Olzhas Suleymenov: "Raising the Steppe, Without Lowering The Mountains"; date of interview not specified; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Excerpts] Alma-Ata—Leonid Martynov wrote the following in the foreword to one of O. Suleymenov's books:

"...Olzhas Suleymenov—a Kazakh poet who writes in Russian—remains wholly a Kazakh poet, the native son of this wonderful, proud people who from time immemorial have linked their needs and aspirations with those of the Russian people. The essence of Olzhas Suleymenov vividly embodies all these ties—every-day, geographical, political, ethnic, and aesthetic."

The poet's creative odyssey ranges from "Land, Worship Man," a poem of his youth devoted to the space breakthrough and written at one sitting, to his finds and discoveries in the space of interactive cultures. [passage omitted].

[Suleymenov] The nationalities question determines the substance of the new phase of restructuring, and it is important for a constructive and conscious solution to this issue to take into consideration the nature of the centripetal and centrifugal forces and ensure balance between them—which is necessary for the existence of any natural body. The laws of physics are also applicable to society.

The raising of national consciousness is intensifying people's attention to problems of language, national traditions, and history. Six Transcaucasian and Baltic republics have already constitutionally enshrined their national language's status as the state language. The same demands can also be heard in other union and autonomous republics. A Kazakh Writers' Union plenum discussed a proposal for two state languages in the republic—Kazakh and Russian. What dictated the "extended" proposal? Knowledge of the real situation prevailing in our area. Two peoples—the Kazakhs and the Russians—are the most numerous by far. They represent 40 percent each. The remaining 20 percent is made up of Germans, Ukrainians, Koreans, Uighurs, Azeris, and others. Moreover, Russian and—in individual oblasts—Kazakh fulfill the functions of languages for interethnic relations. The new status would be an acknowledgment of their role in the republic. It would boost the prestige of the Kazakh language and in time would also broaden the spheres in which it is used . Now it is only fully used in 20 or so economic, cultural, and educational specializations. Russian is used in over 100.

If a national language is not used in production and if it does not help people at work, and, to put it bluntly, if it doesn't sustain them, then it is pushed aside into the domestic, family sphere, into passive reserve. This has happened to Kazakh in most of the republic's cities. We realize that language cannot be protected by any patriotic appeals or constitutional decrees if the social basis for its existence is not developed. In Kazakhstan both party and soviet organs are now working in this area, and the first results have already been achieved. The experience of resolving linguistic problems in the union and autonomous republics should, probably, be studied and generalized in a law on languages.

[Dildyayev] Many slogans are becoming outmoded before our eyes. This also illustrates the rapid passage of time. Kazakhstan used to be described as the laboratory of the peoples' friendship. People were lulled, and suddenly the events of December 1986 took place.

[Suleymenov] We can now say that those events were not unique. They proved to be some of the first links in the chain of a pattern that soon appeared in other republics also. We are still trying to understand the nature of this pattern even now. At first we proceeded down a well-trodden path—we sought the answers to the usual question "Who is to blame?" With the disintegration of state stimulation, even the indisputable values that we acquired in international society were also called into question. It is good that this period passed rapidly. The "laboratory" is, possibly, rough-and-ready, but Kazakhstan is still a republic with friendship among the peoples. This friendship was built not by slogans but by the natural practice of human relations. It is another matter that we regard this asset or—more accurately—this condition more tactfully, attentively, and, even, more anxiously today. This approach, indisputably, helps reveal substantial contradictions and the reasons for them. It also helps alleviate them if there is no chance of fully eliminating them.

I would like to see a more zealous attitude to the propaganda legacy. I think that the slogan "Nations' Prosperity Lies in Rapprochement" cannot be denied. What should replace it? "Prosperity Lies in Division"? "In Self-Isolation"? In order to ensure that this is no empty phrase, the appropriate socioeconomic system for cooperation between nations must be developed consciously—a just system that does not infringe anyone's interests. Writers and scientists could help politicians here. A CPSU Central Committee Plenum will be held in the summer, whose documents, I hope, will provide us with guidance in our troubled practice of interethnic life. I think it would be useful to hold all-union "round tables" involving specialists and literateurs as part of the preparation process for such an important forum. Creative unions and academies usually meet after the event to discuss party plenum decisions that are not dependent on our discussions. The reverse would be good. That is in the spirit of the time. [passage omitted].

Solovyev Visits Leningrad Museum Exhibit

LD2701020189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 26 Jan 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report by S. Dukhavin from the Leningrad History Museum]

[Text] Comrade Solovyev and other party and local soviet leaders today acquainted themselves with the exhibition which tells of the defense of Leningrad during the Great Patriotic War. Comrade Solovyev talked to the

veterans and warmly congratulated them on the upcoming memorial day. He wished them good health and prosperity. [video shows Solovyev at the exhibition, talking to veterans]

Three Sailors Die in Icebreaker Fire

LD3102195189 Moscow TASS in English 1646 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] Arkhangelsk January 31 TASS—Three sailors have died in a fire that broke out last Saturday on board the Vasili Pronchishchev icebreaker. The Vasili Pronchishchev sailed off the berth of the Arkhangelsk port in order to steer a transport vessel across the ice. At 10:05 parts of a cylinder of the main diesel-generator got broken and lubricating oil flared up.

General alarm was raised. At that time V. Lyapin, R. Mustafin (both electricians) and A. Shpilevoy, a motorist, were on duty in a machine compartment. When rescuers made their way through the fire to the compartment, it was too late: the sailors got suffocated by smoke.

The fire was put out. The icebreaker is now under repair.

Boris Yunitsin, USSR deputy minister of merchant marine, said that it remained to be found out what had brought about the fire. However, he continued, it is clear already that the crew's actions during the fire were beyond reproach.

Kuybyshev Oblast Officials Said To Harass Critics

OW2801012889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0645 GMT on 18 January, in its 30-minute "Current Mail" program, presented by V.P. Beketov, focuses its attention on the problem of victimization of junior functionaries, following overt criticism of local senior party officials.

The program begins with Beketov recalling the somewhat unusual situation when, following a visit of journalist C.A. Mario to Krasnyy Yar in Kuybyshev Oblast to investigate constant complaints of bad management and indifference to the plight of the people, a delegation of responsible party officials from that town arrived to plead for the supression of this item. It so happened that last year the "Discussion to the Point" program investigated the flow of complaints and filmed a public meeting at which V. Shevyakov, secretary of the local raykom, was signaled out for particular criticism for indifference and mismanagement. The local kolkhoz chairman was also accused at the meeting of similar wrongdoings. Beketov makes use of the file film to remind viewers of the program and to point out that none of the speakers who spoke out at the meeting managed to retain their previous jobs. Shevyakov saw to it that they were dismissed or hounded out from their positions. Sokolova, the manager of the local printing shop was particularly outspoken in her criticism of Shevyakov. She too was fired. Moreover, after many years of waiting for an apartment, a one room apartment finally became available. Shevyakov was adamant that after she had shamed them in front of the nation, the apartment should not be given to her. However, rayispolkom Chairman Ignatyev insisted that she was entitled to it, and she moved in. Since then, Ignatyev has been removed from his position and, following a local party meeting, chaired by Shevyakov, was severely criticized and demoted on trumped up charges of not paying rent, electricity, and other abuses of power.

The rest of the program is devoted to interviewing people who are convinced that Ignatyev is innocent. Some recall pressure being applied to them to force them into falsifying evidence against Ignatyev. Others recall his competence and the care he displayed for his staff. Several local deputies complain that they were not permitted to speak in Ignatyev's defense at the meeting. The program ends with several Shevyakov's cronies defending him, while Shevyakov himself refused to appear on the program.

Council of Ministers Repeals Decrees on Zhdanov

LD2901213589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2000 GMT 29 Jan 89

[From the "Before and After Midnight" program, presented by Vladimir Molchanov; for earlier reportage on the decision to rescind Zhdanov as a commemorative name, see the Political & Social section of the 24 January Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, p 84 and of the 25 January Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, p 56]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [unidentified correspondent] Good evening. Just a few days ago an event took place for which millions of Soviet people had been waiting a long time. The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers finally adopted a decision to repeal all decrees and decisions connected with perpetuating the memory of Andrey Aleksandrovich Zhdanov. Thus, thanks to the efforts of thousands of people and a powerful wave of public opinion the first difficult, but very important step toward restoring historical justice has been taken. [video shows archive footage of Zhdanov addressing meetings] [passage omitted]

'Delicate Problem' of Inheritance Law Viewed

PM0102094389 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 31 Jan 89 p 2

[Interview with Doctor of Philosophical Sciences V. Rogovin by TASS correspondent Yu. Vorobyevskiy specially for SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA: "Inheritance; It has Been Bequeathed to Us from Stalin's Times"; date and place of interview not stated, first paragraph is SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA introduction]

[Text] Is an inheritance earned income? This question was put to 1,136 Muscovites by staffers of the USSR

Academy of Sciences Sociology Institute. It was with the same question that the TASS correspondent and Doctor of Philosophical Sciences V. Rogovin began their talk on problems of social justice.

Sociologist: Some 26.8 percent of those polled consider an inheritance to be unearned: "After all, the legatee did not work himself." Some 40.2 percent regard it as earned income inasmuch as "it came from parents who earned it by their labor." Some 24 percent were unable to give an unequivocal answer: "An inheritance can be regarded as earned only if it has been acquired by honest means," "if it does not allow the legatee to lead a parasitic way of life, an inheritance of a million is unearned," "the legatee's part in creating the family's wealth is important, as is the degree of kinship."

Journalist: Differences on the delicate problem of incomes and accumulations can be heard even in the articles of journalists. Let's try to analyze this situation. After all, interest in the problem is no accident. At an expanded session of the USSR Council of Ministers which I attended it was stated that according to the estimates of the USSR Gosplan economic scientific research institute there are thousands of millionaires in the country. The point is that according to the figures of that institute the shadow economy's turnover reaches R60-80 billion. The accuracy of the figure may be disputed but it is still clear that the question of the provenance and inheritance of super-fortunes does exist.

Sociologist: Undoubtedly! Although some people assert that under our conditions the institution of inheritance is not as terrible as people try to portray it inasmuch as the size of the earned inheritance is always relatively modest... and it cannot be capitalized, that is you cannot live on the interest or put it "into business."

Journalist: That is doubtful, after all even 2 percent or 4 percent interest rates on deposits in savings banks from large fortunes make it possible to live without poverty. This kind of man, a latter-day "rentier," was described by LENINGRADSKIY RABOCHIY. Now cooperative banks are also appearing and shares are being issued for which the interest rate is far higher. And money can be invested in a cooperative.

Sociologist: The problem is also particularly acute because there is another side to the coin. Poverty. All-union studies in 1981 and 1986 have shown that the number of people living from hand to mouth is increasing.

But let's return to inheritance. In our country the tax on wages reaches 13 percent yet the tax rate for an inheritance is only 10 percent.

Journalist: What is the origin of this?

Sociologist: Let's recall history. The Civil Code introduced in 1923 provided for the inheritance of property worth no more than R10,000. And the number of people allowed to inherit under the law was extremely limited. In connection with the successes of socialism, which ruled out the possibility of man's exploitation of man, this restriction was repealed in 1926. A scale of taxes was established from 1 percent for an inheritance of R1,000-R2,000 to 90 (!) percent when the sum was above R0.5 million. A new tax reform was implemented in 1945. Since then the highest rates of tax on inherited property have been kept at 10 percent. And inherited money is not liable even to that tax.

Journalist: That means that it is a legacy of Stalin's time...

Sociologist: Yes, we must expand the subject of our talk and speak not only of inheritance as such but also of the socioeconomic legacy. Many people have formed the impression that Stalin's regime relied mainly on an obscure mass possessed by the idea of leveling down. That is not so. There was reliance on an elite stratum. Let's take the so-called decile coefficient of wages differentiation. In our country now it is characterized by the ratio of 3:1. At the end of Stalin's time it was 8:1. This is the relation between the wages level above which the earnings 10 percent of the highest-paid workers are placed and the wages level beneath which the earnings of the 10 percent lowest- paid workers are placed.

Here is what F. Raskolnikov wrote to Stalin: "In your convulsive attempts to find support you... are creating one privileged group after another and are showering them with favors and feeding them with handouts... You are forcing the working people to work with the scourges and scorpions of harsh and antiproletarian decrees."

Journalist: But in some journalists' writings you can read that at the most tragic and dramatic times for our country the needs of a cleaning woman and a professor differed little.

Sociologist: In the early fifties the wages of a cleaning woman were about R300 (in the money of the time) while those of a professor reached R10,000 and more. It must be supposed that their needs were formed correspondingly. It is characteristic that the architecture of "Stalinist" houses provided for rooms for servants. Next to the kitchen—that was the place planned for the "R300" person.

In general criticism of Stalinism in recent works has been one-sided. There has been talk of executions and camps but the colossal "spread" of incomes has not been mentioned. It would seem that some people even now would like to see our society just as stratified as it was under Stalin, but without Stalin's repressions.

Journalist: But unfair differentiaion is one reason for the rise in crime. And crime can push someone to resolute measures...

Sociologist: It is characteristic that it was precisely after Stalin's death that changes in social policy began. In 1956-1965 the wages of top ranking leaders were reduced by a factor of 2-3. Reforms—a pension reform and a reform of the agricultural tax—were implemented and the minimum wage was increased... In the early sixties decrees of the supreme soviet presidiums "on the confiscation, without compensation, of the houses, dachas, and other buildings erected or acquired using unearned income" created commissions in all the union republics. If the commissions had reason to suppose that someone was living beyond his means the case was sent to the people's court.

Journalist: But these memories are not to the liking of some "aristocrats of the mind," who are not averse to donning the robe of the "work superintendent" of restructuring. The first precept of their virtue is that it is indecent to look into someone else's pocket. They greatly dislike proposals to introduce the declaration of incomes and progressive taxation.

Sociologist: Yet V.I. Lenin ridiculed those who saw in this control an encroachment on their "private lives," "a criminal investigation," and "informing." All these measures are not only socialist but also democratic, he said.

Indeed, in the capitalist countries there are very powerful tax inspection services (superprofits are sometimes taxed at up to 80 percent). Moreover, public opinion unequivocally considers anyone who conceals his income to be a thief. Approaches toward the problem of income differentiation are also interesting. At a scientific conference in the GDR I put this question to a Swedish colleague. It turned out that under the Social Democrats the difference between the average wage of a worker, on the one hand, and a manager, writer, or important official on the other was in the ratio of 1:2. I also remember the following sentence from a well known sociologist: "The policy of equalizing incomes ensures the reliability of any labor." It is not the size of the differentiation of incomes which prompts people to highly productive labor but the criteria for this differentiation. The question which is important is not how much is paid, but for what.

Journalist: Many polemicists, in seeking to justify superprofits, do not consider foreign experience when it suits them (as in the case of declarations) and when necessary cling strenuously to this experience. They often cite the large royalties of figures of art and culture in Western countries but forget to say that the movie producer I. Bergman was obliged to leave Sweden for several years when the government there imposed what was from his viewpoint an excessively high tax on his income. What I have said does not of course mean that everyone must be paid the same.

Sociologist: Let's think about the following figures. In Vuzes 41 percent of students come from workers' families while workers account for 62 percent of the population. Half the students come from the intelligentsia. Yet the intelligentsia accounts for only 27 percent of the population. Or another point: Some 63.4 percent of those questioned by sociologists speak of the violation of justice when distributing types of work deepening on a worker's qualifications, knowledge, experience, and skills.

Journalist: This should be investigated, but the supporters of unrestricted differentiation are inventing ever new arguments in their favor.

Sociologist: It seems that (apart from some cooperative members) a figure of literature or art can become a "legal" millionaire today. This situation also goes back to Stalin's time. In 1947 the progressive tax on total royalties for republication and for the performance or other use of works of literature and art, whereby the progression reached 45 percent, was abolished. As a result both those who receive an entirely moderate wage and those who rake in many thousands now pay the same percentage of their income.

Attempts to sort out the criteria for differentiation should not be confused with juggling with "wretched leveling down." Incidentally, it was Stalin who first introduced these words to the political lexicon. At the 17th congress.

Journalist: It seems that leveling down is now used to frighten the people, just as the stepping up of the class struggle was once used to frighten them. But why do these distortions occur?

Sociologist: Let's recall the words Marx uttered with regard to a related social science: "The unique nature of the material with which political economy deals brings to the arena of the struggle against free scientific research the fiercest, vilest, most revolting passions of the human sole—the furies of private interest."

We might as well cite a political economy textbook published in 1954: "The socialist state's policy in the field of the remuneration of labor is implemented in the struggle against petit bourgeois leveling down on the basis of the comprehensive differentiation of wages: higher wages for skilled and heavy labor and the labor of leading professions and sectors of the national economy."

We have not settled the remuneration of skilled labor to this day but dealing with the "leading professions" is very simple—you compile a list and it's all there. But however they tried to sanctify these arbitrary decisions as "scientific" arguments, the result is not very convincing.

Journalist: That is precisely why highly influential circles are hostile toward attempts to investigate the socioeconomic nature of present-day income and property differentiation. And, dissatisfied with the attention paid to their fortunes, they tell the others: You can grow rich too! But that is a subject for a separate talk.

Health Ministry Psychiatrist Interviewed

PM3101133389 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 31 Jan 89 p 4

[Interview with A. Karpov, USSR Health Ministry chief specialist for psychiatry, by I. Baranovskiy: "Visit to the Psychiatrist"; date and place of interview not stated; first paragraph is SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA introduction]

[Text] People do not rush to make an appointment with this doctor, they prefer to bypass his office. Yet thousands and thousands of people are in need of psychiatrists' assistance. What prevents them from obtaining it—fear, ignorance, or the bad reputation of the healers of the soul? Our correspondent asked A. Karpov, chief specialist for psychiatry at the USSR Ministry of Health, to answer these and other questions.

[Karpov] Alas, many people believe that if someone has visited a psychiatrist then he must be suffering from a serious mental illness. Yet people could have gone to the doctor for the most innocuous reason—because of insomnia, overtiredness, or irritability. But those around him often argue according to the well-known saying: "Either he has stolen something or something has been stolen from him, and it is better to keep away from the man." We suggested abandoning the traditional labels and tags: removing from them the embarrassing words "psychoneurological" and "psychiatric." The AUCCTU did not support this idea. The reason was, it said, that it would be difficult to consider "the nature of citizens' illness."

[Baranovskiy] It is probably not only a case of the risky reputation of your service, some people simply do not suspect that a psychiatrist is precisely the specialist they need.

[Karpov] And they operate using the salutary formula: "It's nothing terrible, my nerves have been playing up on me"— as though nervous disorders were not psychiatric, as though people can manage here with self treatment. I would advise not delaying a visit to the psychiatrist: There is no point in building up negative emotions, they must be gotten rid of as quickly as possible. Incidentally, approximately 30 percent of all visitors to polyclinics are potential clients of ours. They storm the offices of therapists, cardiologists, and endocrinologists and complain of pains in the heart, stomach, and liver. They are examined and treated, often without result, and the complaints do not cease. And that is not surprising, after all they have completely different illnesses—concealed forms of depression, the results of the stress they have experienced.

In many countries consulting a psychiatrist is an absolutely ordinary matter. But in our country a visit and especially treatment from such a specialist is considered in some way shameful. And until he is at the end of his tether, as they say, he will not appear in a hospital. It is a good thing if at least he turns to the doctors himself, but sometimes you have to persuade him and prove that he is in extreme need of treatment. Hence the sorry statistic: Nearly all places in the country's 500 psychiatric hospitals are taken. That means that the early preventive treatment system is working badly—bypassing the psychoneurological dispensaries, people go directly to hospital beds.

[Baranovskiy] I do not think it is merely a matter of your patients' prejudice. For instance, someone goes to the doctor complaining of a nervous disorder and leaves the office as a "registered" patient. With all ensuing consequences: restrictions in the choice of profession, a ban on trips abroad and driving an automobile... This is not gossip from fellow employees—it is disenfranchisement.

[Karpov] In March last year the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree "on approving the clause on the conditions and procedure for rendering psychiatric aid" came into force. Since then great changes have taken place in our service. Whereas before if a serious psychological disorder was found in someone he was registered in 9 cases out of 10, now we avoid this measure. Of course, on condition that our patient has a serious attitude toward his illness and is seeking to get rid of it. In less than a year we have removed from the register about 10 percent of all "registered" patients. In all there are about 5 million of them in the country.

If a person is under constant observation by a psychiatrist that is no longer a reason for depriving him of the right to work in his special area, to correspond, or to adopt. He can be on the register and hold a responsible post, drive an automobile, and go on business trips abroad. It all depends on the nature and severity of the illness and on how the patient himself treats it—seriously or frivolously.

[Baranovskiy] But if a person disagrees with the specialist's finding? The psyche is a delicate fabric and, unless I am wrong, diagnosis in psychiatry cannot boast of accurate quantitative methods.

[Karpov] Of course, we are not ensured against errors. Nonetheless there is a sufficiently harmonious system of criteria with whose aid it is possible to determine whether a person is healthy or sick. It is based on the developments of the school of German psychiatrists, which are used in the majority of countries. If the patient disagrees with the diagnosis, he can appeal against the

doctors' actions to any higher ranking health organ, or directly to the court, whose task is to create an independent commission of specialists to check the psychiatrists' finding.

[Baranovskiy] How then to explain the fact that for all these painstaking and sophisticated diagnostics, healthy people have ended up in psychiatric clinics? Reports have appeared in the press that dissidents, disturbers of public order, and citizens inconvenient to someone or other have been kept there. Do you know of such instances?

[Karpov] Indeed, there have been cases where people who were not in need of hospitalization ended up in our clinics. But they were sick people. They could perfectly well have been observed at home, as out patients. And here it is not a case of the powerlessness of diagnostics or of some sinister intent. As in any profession we still have plenty of incompetent workers. Now that the restructuring of the entire service is under way we are getting rid of them. Of course, there have been abuses—criminals have been harbored in hospitals, and fake certificates releasing people from Army service have been issued. Your newspaper has written about this, incidentally. As for dissidents, I do not know of a single instance of a person being placed in a psychiatric clinic for his convictions. It is perfectly possible that there were such cases in the time of stagnation but in 2 years of work as chief specialist for psychiatry I have not encountered them.

[Baranovskiy] But what about press publications and the reports of radio voices? After all they cite the specific names of the victims of psychiatrists' tyranny.

[Karpov] We have checked all statements regarding the unjustified placing of people in psychiatric hospitals — there were no healthy people among them. For instance, foreign rights defenders recently sent the ministry an enquiry about one "dissident." We looked into the archives and it emerged that in 1977, using a grenade as a threatening weapon, he hijacked an aircraft to Finland. The criminal was handed over and sentenced to 15 years. But after a while he was found to have a serious psychological disorder. Of course, the patient was sent to the clinic. They immediately raised a din in the West, saying that another champion of rights had been put away.

It must also be considered that it is not that simple to send a healthy person to a hospital bed. First he must be certified by the psychiatric first aid doctor and then by the duty psychiatrist in the inpatients' clinic admissions department and then the incoming patient will be observed without fail for 3 days by a competent commission. All these doctors have no connections at all so that the possibility of collusion is ruled out. According to the provision which has been adopted a person today can disagree with the doctor's finding and with the extension of his period of treatment and can demand to be discharged from the hospital. Where necessary he has the right to enjoy the aid of a lawyer. In addition, at the wish of the patient or his relations, the examination commission can include any psychiatrist practicing in a given region. The provision also includes a point on the doctor's criminal responsibility for hospitalizing a person he knows to be healthy. This crime is punished by up to 2 years in prison.

[Baranovskiy] As I have understood it, reliable legal and social guarantees have now been created for your patients. Psychiatric aid has become a strictly voluntary matter. The list of professions requiring special medical conditions of entrance has been reduced to the minimum. But will this not lead to the other extreme: to the growth of injuries, crime, and suicides? After all a sick person may be at the wheel of an automobile or control panel or, finally, in possession of weapons. And no one now has the right to certify him without his consent. Do you not fear you will lose control over the situation?

[Karpov] Well, first, we realize that individual patients are dangerous to those around them. That is why psychiatrists still have the right to immediately hospitalize a patient. Of course, weighty reasons are needed for this—a direct threat to his own life or someone else's. Second, pilots, drivers, and all those on whom the lives of tens and hundreds of people depend still cannot do without our finding when they are taking up employment.

Economic

Economist Urges Budget Cuts To Reduce Deficit

PM3101165589 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 29 Jan 89 p 2

[Candidate of Economic Sciences L. Piyasheva article under the "Viewpoint" rubric: "Prosperity on Credit. Living Standards and Real Incomes. Paying Back Debts Incurred by Our 'Fathers.' The Budget and Economically Accountable Enterprises"]

[Text] We have started a new working year. What will it bring to society and each and every citizen of our country?

Let us try to carefully read between the lines of the report by Gosplan Chairman Yu. Maslyukov at the USSR Supreme Soviet's October session, in which he summed up the results of the past years of restructuring. This is what he told us: "The most important result of this period... is the fact that the economy has extricated itself from the precrisis situation."

Is this so? Can an economy accomplish a breakthrough and extricate itself from a precrisis situation without having cleared away the accumulated structural contradictions, without having improved its health by eliminating loss-making production units, without having released labor and capital from sectors that are unable to compete? None of this has been achieved during the 3

years of restructuring. Moreover, loss-making enterprises remain, as before, a burden on the state budget and squander funds that could be channeled into the modernization of the economic structure. The officially announced total of losses incurred by enterprises amounts to R11 billion. (I think this figure has been substantially understated.)

The year 1989 has been proclaimed the year of completing the transfer to full economic accountability and self-financing. Concretizing this proposition, Yu. Ma[illegible]yukov asserts that state orders will be reduced even further. Correspondingly, the quantity of centrally distributed resources will be reduced from 5,100 designated categories in 1988 to 546 in 1989, while wholesale trade turnover will almost triple.

In this way, the Gosplan chairman declares, "...the center, as represented by the USSR Gosplan and the USSR Gossnab, will cease being the sole holder and distributor of all resources... This fundamental change in the plan's nature has still not been sufficiently appreciated by all enterprise, ministry, and department leaders. Proof of this can be seen in the stream of demands for additional allocation of material and technical resources and requests for expanded state orders."

In other words, we have before us the same old picture, but on a somewhat reduced scale. There is no point in trying to prove yet again that it is impossible in principle to achieve a wholesale trade market when resources are centrally distributed without a free price formation system. And the "planned" indicators of its growth are nothing but pure and simple fiction. In the same way, there can be no faith in the figures showing reduction of centrally-distributed resources. While this mechanism as a whole continues to function, we cannot expect any transition to a wholesale trade market and economic autonomy because here we are confusing quantity with quality. This also applies to the volume of state orders "planned" in percentage terms. It is only natural that if there is no wholesale trade market, enterprises will strive for 100-percent state orders. After all, resources will be made available primarily for state orders!

It must be admitted that so far this is not a matter of transfer to economic accountability and economic autonomy but of controlled reduction in the number of planned indicators, the size of state plan targets, and the funds released "for this purpose." It is obvious that there is no reason to expect any growth in consumer goods from such a half-hearted reform, because by no means will all enterprises that have been cut off from quotas be able to ensure accelerated growth, let alone the modernization they need.

The second point I would like to ponder is budget policy. The large state budget deficit in 1989 is attributed to the fact that "the population's unsatisfied demand that has built up over the last three 5-year plan periods currently stands at tens of billions of rubles."

Despite the fact that the task in the economic policy sphere is formulated as "raising the people's living standards," the intention is to solve this problem by reducing the population's real incomes. This is how it is explained. "The new principles of economic management must ultimately lead to the point where labor productivity growth will be significantly faster that the growth of the average monthly wage. Only thus will it be possible to overcome imbalances in the domestic market."

Growth in wages corresponding to growth in labor productivity is considered natural in economic life. Faster growth in wages leads to inflation. Economic lagging, on the other hand, attacks living standards. And this is actually being envisaged for the immediate future. (It must be said that it is virtually impossible for such a situation to develop in the contemporary Western world, where trade unions vigilantly watch to ensure that wage levels do not fall in the least behind the pace of labor productivity growth.)

Thus, we are faced with an "attack on two fronts": The present intention is to overcome the consequences of past policies, not by rejecting administrative interference but by devaluing savings and curtailing the pace of growth in wages.

It is well known that real wage growth is determined by the relationship between the pace of nominal wages growth and price increases. This indicator cannot be planned. It becomes known only after price increases have taken place. But how is it possible to plan the growth of real incomes without knowing how far prices will rise in 1989?

Moreover, the plan is to increase the wages of workers in health care and social security services and the salaries and fees of VUZ professors and lecturers and some categories of cultural workers. How does the government intend to fund an increase in the real level of working people's incomes, even if only against the "standard" base line?

History has recorded numerous financial crashes, and every government strives to keep a tight rein on its money, preventing the process of cumulative price increases and devaluation of its currency. This is the classical goal of any budget policy.

But USSR Finance Minister B. Gostev announced in his published report "On the USSR State Budget in 1989 and the Performance of the USSR State Budget in 1987":

"For many years on end, the state's expenditures have exceeded its revenue. The imbalance was sharply exacerbated toward the end of the previous 5-year plan period by a slowdown in the pace of economic development... The growth of the population's incomes exceeded the opportunities to satisfy demand, which led to the economically unjustified issuance of money and to inflationary processes."

It is not hard to see that the government, while recklessly printing bank notes that devalue incomes not backed by goods, is trying to present its inflationary financial policy as a measure that had been forced on it. And this measure was apparently conditioned by the growth of working people's personal savings. Everything has been turned upside down. What was it that forced the financial organs, on which the law makes it incumbent to guard money stability and under no circumstances release the genie of inflation from its bottle, to undermine the financial foundations of our economic prosperity during the relatively stable and prosperous oil boom years in the seventies?

The answer is simple: They had to ensure growth rates and plan fulfillment, maintain full employment, complete the grand construction projects of the century, irrigate and drain, change the course of rivers, and feed the bureaucratic machine that promised stability and growing prosperity.

Budget expenditures in 1989 will increase 11.5 percent compared to last year. Consequently, the budget deficit has been set at R36.3 billion.

Why is it that today we are confessing the old and diligently concealed sins while passing a deficit budget? The finance minister attributes this to the loss of revenue resulting from the sharp decline in world oil prices (because of which the budget shortfall amounts to almost R40 billion since the start of the 12th 5-Year Plan period); to losses in turnover tax because "the production and sales of wine and vodka products were often set by local organs below the level envisaged by appropriate decisions" (more than R36 billion); to the increase in appropriations for the social sphere by more than R18 billion over and above the 5-year plan; and finally, to unforeseen expenditures to eliminate the consequences of the Chernobyl accident (more than R8 billion).

"At present, and despite the measures being taken to intensify production, the growth of revenue is insufficient and lags behind the growing needs," B. Gostev explains.

The logic of it all! The reduction of revenue under two of our budget's headings—the reckless sale of oil abroad and the sale of wine and vodka products which, as everyone knows, were the "props" of our budget—determines active attraction of funds along other channels. What channels? Foreign credits and deductions from industrial enterprises' profits. And all this is happening while we are in the middle of an economic reform whose objective is self-financing?

If our task is still to increase incoming payments into the "common pot" (whose size, in any case, significantly exceeds what would be economically sensible) so as to subsequently redistribute them in accordance with "growing needs," then there can be no question at all of economic autonomy and self-financing. No combine or plant is capable of simultaneously feeding the budget and engaging in free economic activity, not even within the framework of economic freedom as envisaged by the Law on the Enterprise. These are mutually exclusive goals.

The task of the Ministry of Finance is to distribute funds in a way that, while ensuring the best possible solution of urgent problems, does not undermine our economic prosperity.

The social orientation of expenditures is an important task. But here again we come up against the same dilemma: Where do we obtain the funds? We will not become any richer by extracting the bulk of them from enterprises and redistributing them through the budget. Society will be able to spend more on social needs only if a major economic reform is really, in fact rather than in words, unfolded in our country and entrepreneurial initiative is released from the constraints of administrative economic management. This, and this alone, is capable of ensuring the growth of industrial enterprises' incomes, supplying markets with goods, and increasing appropriations for social needs. Otherwise, we are obtaining prosperity on credit. In other words, the building of new schools and medical institutions will be funded by issuing money and devaluing our incomes.

There is full justification for believing that this year's plan involves a flawed inflationary strategy. Our children will have to pay for the debts that have been incurred—the oil that has been sold off and the foreign credits we now intend to obtain.

Yet we do have sizeable reserves for cutting back state expenditures. Logically speaking, budget expenditure categories like "Targeted Budget Subsidies for Food and Other Social Needs" and "Centralized Financing of Expenditures by National Economic Sectors" (which account for 55.7 percent of the budget!) ought to be reduced. After all, the first category accounts for funds channeled to cover price imbalances that have existed in our country since the twenties. As for the second, it determines the extent to which economic autonomy is lacking and the losses are incurred by the national economy. In a healthy economic system, the amount of budget expenditures for economic needs ought to be reduced to a minimum.

To continue, defense spending has been set at R20.2 billion. (This represents 4.1 percent, which, in the opinion of many economists, is understated many times over, just like the expenditures on state administration, which stands at R2.9 billion or 0.6 percent).

I believe that an explanation of the true amount of the military and administrative budgets is long overdue, and it is there that reserves for reducing the budget deficit should be sought.

For the time being, unfortunately, it must be stated that the initial concept of reform, which involved the passing of ineffective legislation, leads to a series of willful decisions which maintain inflation. Therefore, the desire for change is not enough just by itself. It is necessary to have a precise idea of the end goal and the means to attain it.

Economist Urges Stronger Role for Gosbank

PM3101131589 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 26 Jan 89 p 1

[Candidate of Economic Sciences V. Bochkov "Economist's Remarks": "Banking Boom?"]

[Text] Moscow—Today it is clear to everyone: The economic reform will not take off without a radical restructuring of the banking system. What was the role played by banks yesterday? Not altogether without pressure from local party and soviet organs, they pumped into the national economy vast sums that were not backed up by commodity resources. Credit facilities were granted without justification, including facilities to cover losses by enterprises, sovkhozes, and kolkhozes. All this naturally created serious complications in money circulation.

But what about today? There seems to have been a turnabout in the entire banking business. We have a whole family of banks—the USSR Gosbank, the USSR Bank for Industrial Construction, the USSR Agro-Industrial Bank, the USSR Bank for Housing and Municipal Services and Social Development. And even though it is too early to evaluate their work, some people are already in a state of euphoria, holding forth about their supposedly vast potential and influence on the economy's development.

On the other hand, there are increasingly obvious attempts to copy the capitalist model of banking. Here, however, people seem to forget two points: Banks in the West operate in a real commodity market, and, most important of all, the goals they pursue are far removed from the ones we strive to attain.

Blinded by the might of capitalist banks, some of our home bankers forget a simple truth: Excessive enthusiasm for banking business in an underdeveloped commodity market could exacerbate the financial situation. Look, for example, at the credit relations between enterprises and the new banks. There have been no serious changes in this regard. The banks have yet to become their business partners. This is no accident. After all, the majority of collectives have their own funds which, incidentally, they cannot always use to buy the materials and equipment they need. Why do they need credit facilities in addition?

And what benefit can accrue from increasing the amount of consumer credit if it, too, is not backed up by commodities? Even worse, there is a real danger that loan repayment cannot be guaranteed in conditions of chronic shortages.

To continue. We still have not organized wholesale trade in the means of production and in materials. This being so, any intensive utilization of credit facilities by cooperatives could still further devalue the ruble, which is already tattered.

There you have the situation in which some people started proclaiming: Let us set up banks. The banks will save us, they claim; they will immediately produce a commodities market. And so it was done. There was the idea of setting up banks for separate sectors. More than 40 commercial banks were set up, including 24 by cooperatives and 17 by state enterprises.

Characteristically, in addition to the aforementioned difficulties, the banking boom has also produced the proliferation of a rather costly apparatus. After all, the maintenance of this apparatus ultimately means dipping deep inside enterprises' pockets. Somehow, no one talks about this. But facts are stubborn things. We can already see, for example, that the reformed banking system in Poltava Oblast employs 160 people, while it used to have 35 fewer. Last year there was a noticeable deterioration in money circulation itself in the Poltava region.

The complications the country encounters in the sphere of money circulation can also be attributed to the fact that an abnormal situation has developed in our country whereby the Gosbank is responsible for cash receipts while cash is issued by the Bank for Industrial Construction, the Agro-Industrial Bank, and the Bank for Housing and Municipal Services and Social Development.

I am convinced that the setting up of a multilayer network of banks poses the threat of uselessly pumping money into the national economy on an even greater scale than in past years. This is but a step removed from more serious commodity shortages and intensification of inflationary processes. Even so, I would not like to so abruptly end a discussion of problems concerning the expediency of sector banks for the proper organization of sector and intersector money circulation. But I must emphasize: The banking reform will be successful only under a strong Gosbank. As matters stand today, it has been assigned the role of simply coordinating the activity of its specialized "brethren." In essence, it has been deprived of a living link with ongoing economic processes. All credit and payment transactions and the organization and actual conduct of money circulation are, to all intents and purposes, performed by branches of the specialized banks. In addition to all this, the Gosbank has been deprived of its own working organs at local level. In these conditions, how can it be described as the country's single center for payments, credits, and

currency emission? It has extremely limited opportunities to influence specialized and sector banks, let alone cooperative and commercial banks.

No socialist country's main bank finds itself in such a position. National banks have exceptionally great importance in most countries in the world. They engage in credit and payment transactions. They determine credit and interest rate policy; they organize and regulate money circulation. It is they, as a rule, who monitor the work of commercial and other banks.

The weakening of the USSR Gosbank's ties with all links of the national economy is especially noticeable against the background of incipient undesirable processes in the economy. For example, a sizable gap between wage growth and labor productivity growth has developed for the first time during the period of restructuring. The alarm signals are to a certain extent also due to the slackening of [illegible]itoring functions by banking institutions.

In itself, the position of specialized ban[illegible] and especially cooperative and comm[illegible] fraught with the threat that their activity [illegible]ect the selfish interests of certain population gr[illegible]ns is why every territorial unit—be it a rayon, c[illegible] oblast, an autonomous or union republic, let a[illegible] country as whole—needs a single banking center. [illegible] impossible to achieve without a network of Gosban[illegible]titutions in every territorial cell. Their presence will help take into account the specific features of the development of individual regions' economies and help to organize stable and balanced money circulation. The only important point is expanding the economic rights of appropriate territorial banks, not least by giving them an opportunity for autonomous management of credit resources.

By way of an objection, someone might say that we have actually set up a USSR Banks Council headed by the USSR Gosbank chairman for the purpose of implementing state policy in the sphere of money circulation and credit in our country. But it engages merely in coordination activity. Banking work requires the implementation of a policy regarding credit and the organization and regulation of money circulation that is specific and binding on everyone. This is why we wish to see the Gosbank play a leading role. It could provide a unified centralized credit and money system coupled with broad autonomy for territorial, specialized, and other banks. It could become, in the full sense of the word, the country's single currency emission, credit, and payment center.

It could perform its role as main bank through emission operations, by regulating interest charges for credit facilities, by ensuring cash implementation of the country's budget, by accumulating the necessary credit resources, and by granting credits to other banks when necessary. It would be expedient to include among the Gosbank's duties the solution of questions of setting up new autonomous units in light of the country's economic interests.

Apart from the well known positive aspects, the reform of the banking system has given rise to a real danger of diluting unified state policy in the sphere of money circulation and credit. Consequently, there is a need for serious corrections here.

Economist Urges Elimination of Food Subsidies

PM3101114589 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 18 Jan 89 p 2

[Article by Prof V. Kiselev, doctor of economic sciences, under the "Standpoint" rubric: "Subsidy-Free Prices"]

[Text] I am certain that if you remove control today the prices of many agricultural products will rocket. There is no need for surprise here: Various estimates indicate there is a food shortfall of R25-30 billion, compared to effective demand. And if prices were more accessible the deficit would be even greater. That does not mean we are starving. However, we are constantly aware of a lack of the most expensive products.

The most disagreeable thing in the present situation is that a price increase does not promise growth in the output of agricultural products. The cause—the ineffectiveness of economic levers, the inertia of the economy, and overbureaucratization—are well known. Production is now geared to the plan indicator: "We've met the target and that's that." Whether the output has gotten to the consumer or whether it was needed at all are not questions that worry anyone.

Gearing production to direct satisfaction of needs means giving people the opportunity, without any instructions from above, to produce what enjoys the greatest demand and to send goods where they are most needed. This was discussed in the article "Trade in the Role of Purchaser" (SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 12 January 1989). Prices have great significance under such conditions.

We consider the stability of our retail prices a great achievement. In actual fact, they show the weakness and conservatism of our economy. If we are to eliminate our chronic food shortages, at least two problems must be solved. First, production must be made flexible, mobile, and responsive to a change in "external" conditions, including prices. Second, prices should become equilibrium prices, expressing the degree of public demand for a product.

The market is a sensitive barometer. You need only deliver more meat and prices will certainly begin to come down. If there are few people selling it in the market, then prices creep up. But there are special situations where the amount of an available product is equal to effective demand. In that situation you get a so-called equilibrium price. Only such prices can perform the role of economic levers in solving the food problem.

However, any proposal to make prices flexible causes justified misgivings: Whether there will be growth in production or not is unknown, but prices will certainly jump. Therefore, the nature of the balance between commodities and money and the ways of achieving it must be studied with the utmost care.

The state now spends around R30 billion in subsidizing meat, R20 billion on dairy industry output, and around R10 billion on vegetables, sugar, fish, potatoes, grain, and other products. This money is received by the meat and dairy industry, canning plants, and the procurement network to settle their accounts with the farms. A steer is transported 400 km to be slaughtered and half the weight is lost not because it cannot be slaughtered on the spot—any peasant can do that—but because it must be bought by the holder of a subsidy at a high price and sold to the populace at a low one. No other way is allowed! Can there be direct ties between production and sale in this situation?

Let us examine what subsidizing consumption has given us and the role it plays in life in general. A subsidy or grant is unearned money the state spends to sustain certain strata of the population or a form of activity. It can be delivered to the population directly in the form of allowances or be used to lower prices. Both forms are used throughout the world. However, its purpose is always clearly designated.

In the United States, for example, farmers receive subsidies for not making full use of their land, not growing as much grain or producing as much milk as they could—and overproduction is thereby avoided. In Japan, on the other hand, the level of expenditures compared to world market prices is very high. And farmers receive state subsidies to develop production in order to maintain the country's political and military autonomy. The GDR has introduced a subsidy on certain food products to maintain demand for them and, correspondingly, the volume of production.

In our country the purpose of subsidies is not very clear. It would be logical to encourage the consumption of valuable products which are not, however, in demand—expensive juices, vegetables, and fruit. Alas, the consumption of already scarce and not so healthy products like butter, for example, is encouraged.

It would be understandable if subsidies were earmarked for socially vulnerable people who are still not or are no longer in a position to earn enough on their own. But it would be simpler in this case to increase their allowance by the appropriate sum.

Unduly low prices, however, mean that subsidies are allocated not to the needy, nor uniformly to all the population, but in proportion to the number of goods consumed. But in a scarcity situation, they themselves are not equally available to all. Meat at state prices, for example, is first delivered to major cities. The subsidies on it therefore go to their citizens; and outside the cities, to workers in trade and management.

Calculations show that an overwhelming proportion of subsidies go to roughly 10 percent of the population. The rest have to make do with the market. Budgeting survey figures show that families with a monthly income of around R50 per capita pay 50 percent more per kilo of beef than a family with a per capita income in excess of R200.

It is time to call things by their proper names: Our commodity subsidies have not pursued any social objectives at all. They have developed haphazardly and have been gradually increased to disguise the declining efficiency of production in the country and the rise in prime costs. Few people have benefited from this. And everyone has lost out.

This results in extraordinary situations: Peasants living in the vicinity of quite well-provisioned cities do not eat their home-produced meat. They sell it to the kolkhoz or sovkhoz for R4 per kilo and then buy meat for themselves in the city for R2, thereby encumbering transport and increasing the waiting lines in the cities. The only reason no one now travels into the city from the outskirts of Kostroma, Sverdlovsk, or Novosibirsk is that there is no meat to be had there. But when it does appear a swarm of customers immediately pours in from the countryside.

People are used to a certain pattern of consumption, to a certain budget. This must be taken into account. Nevertheless, order must be introduced. Limited subsidies can be perfectly justified socially. It is necessary only to sort out whom and what to subsidy. And the main thing is that this be done in such a way that the subsidies reach their target. Cutting workers' income tax by R30 billion and increasing allowances, pensions, and grants by that same amount could be socially justified. But retail prices themselves must be brought into line with the amount of goods available. In other words, brought up to the equilibrium price level. An increase in prices will basically concern meat, butter, and cheese. And it will directly affect the interests only of those who consume an inordinate amount of those products.

Moreover, the increase in prices itself must be carried out primarily through a sharp, quality-dependent differentiation in product prices. Our economy is unique in possessing the inexplicable phenomenon whereby whether you buy a little, rotten potato or a large, healthy one, the price is 10 kopeks per kilo. Whether the portion of frozen meat you buy is rump, chuck, or fillet, you pay R2 per kilo. It is no wonder that these products are successfully "selected" by workers in the trade: They sell you the bones and take the meat home, sell you the small, green mandarins, and take the yellow ones for themselves. But we all pay the same.

I think it essential to establish marked, quality-based price differentiation: The worst cuts of meat, those the ordinary customer gets in the store, R2 per kilo; while that which goes out the back door—R4, and even more for fillet steak. The average price of a carcass will rise 50 percent. Small, substandard potatoes will remain at 10 kopeks per kilo, with prime potatoes at 30-40 kopeks. The consumer will lose nothing, as you get what you pay for—kilo for kilo of end product. With the establishment of such price differentiation, it is essential to ban the sale of ungraded goods. It is essential that all stores display models or samples so customers get to know their rights better.

What will such a prices policy give? In addition to social justice, there will be a redistribution of goods among cities and strata of the population and their consumption will become more uniform. The sales volume, of vegetables and meat, in particular, will also grow. There will be an opportunity to radically change the system of procuring and reprocessing agricultural products, to merge it with agricultural production, and to give farms access to retail or small-scale wholesale trade.

Livestock—on which scarce feed is expended—are now kept on farms an average of 3-4 months more because of the small handling capacity of meat combines and the shortage of freezer facilities. Additionally, 10-15 percent of the slaughtered weight is lost during transportation and waiting in line. If farms are permitted to slaughter livestock themselves and sell it in nearby cities or to economically accountable procurement organizations, meat output will grow by 20 percent and outlay fall by 25 percent.

Equilibrium prices must be set at the lowest possible level, and for this the full national economic outlays on goods must be reduced. You cannot rely on economic accountability alone here. Purposeful administrative measures are also necessary. We should stop subsidizing loss-making and low-profit-making farms, stop seeding eroded soil, and reduce the head of unproductive livestock. All in all this will enable expenditures to be cut by R25 billion. And that money should be channeled into developing the spheres of storage and processing in the countryside itself.

'Precrisis' Economy Blamed on Stalinist Dogmas

PM2701154989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Gennadiy Lisichkin article: "Dogmas and Life"]

[Excerpts] Our economy's precrisis condition is totally rooted in the ossified dogmas of the so-called "personality cult" period.

It can hardly be said that there is a shortage of criticism of Stalin today. But let us pause and think: Which of his theoretical tenets have we actually succeeded in thoroughly reinterpreting and rejecting? The thesis about the mounting class struggle. The "contribution" toward linguistics. Views on the peasantry question—to a far lesser extent. A few bits and pieces in the sphere of political economy... In short, not a lot. Even though each such tenet is followed by a long train of lamentable and at times even tragic consequences.

Even worse, the incorrect and scholastic ideas about socialism formulated by Stalin were thoroughly incorporated by him in the practice of our economic and state structure, in the skeleton of the bureaucratic administrative-edict system which is so furiously resisting restructuring today. This is the explanation of the phenomenon of Stalinshchina's tenacity. These ideas are not just alive in the dogmas firmly instilled in our minds ever since childhood, they are also part and parcel of our ideas of life and of some still-existing structures.

Take for example this belief, which has utterly permeated as right the minds of personnel of all ranks: The more product (use values) we produce, the better it will be for each and every one of us. But experience convinces us that this is not so.

For example, our country extracts more oil and gas than the United States. As regards cast iron and steel, we produce almost double what the United States produces. We manufacture almost five times as many tractors. As for combine harvesters, it is almost immodest to talk about them—112,000 of ours against 14,000 of theirs... In short, we have built up a more than substantial material and technical potential.

It may be supposed that the financial base and the Soviet ruble's prestige are equally great. After all, the state's revenues from oil and oil products alone reached the astronomical sum of $176 billion in the 10 years between 1974 and 1984! Furthermore, even though we do not boast of our gold reserves, our neighbor's all-seeing eye estimates that our gold extraction fluctuates between 250 and 350 tonnes a year. Exports of this precious metal for freely convertible currency are estimated at some 200 tonnes a year over the last 2 decades. Let us note that the price of gold on the world market is now 12-13 times higher than it was 20 years ago.

Given such wealth, we should be living in a land of milk and honey—that is what will be said by anyone who was raised on the self-evident truth that "productive forces are not only the most mobile and most revolutionary element of production. They are simultaneously the determining element of the development of production. The nature of productive forces determines the nature of production relations." Especially in a country which is... "a model of **total** (my emphasis—G.L.) conformity of production relations to the nature of productive forces..." (I.V. Stalin. Short Course, p 118). So a fact which is obvious to anyone who is not blinded by the grandeur of Stalin's theoretical legacy seems quite inexplicable: Despite the country's tremendous actual rather than potential wealth, we are a long way away from the land of milk of honey.

Even though national income has more than trebled compared with 1950, we are 1.7 times behind the United States in terms of this indicator. Moreover, the volume of national income used for personal consumption per capita in our country is almost three times lower. And each unit of national income involves the expenditure of far more resources than in the developed countries. This is another important cause of the slow growth of people's prosperity and of the erosion of the Soviet ruble's prestige.

People who are not blinkered by devotion to Stalin's theoretical legacy realized a long time ago that we are still an immense distance away from **total** conformity between productive forces and production relations. The foremost proof that these doubts are correct is provided by the very gap between the mighty production potential created in our country and the way we live. Accepting such an obvious truth is obviously as difficult as recognizing the nakedness of "the emperor in his new clothes." After all, recognizing that productive forces are not in conformity with production relations means—no more and no less—admitting that state property is not a synonym for property owned by the whole people, that our socialized production is by no means as socialized as we have imagined or would like it to be, and that we disorient production by creating use values **rather than values.** As a result of all this, we must be prepared to live as we do now. [passage omitted]

Marx and Engels drew a clear distinction between two types of socialization—economic and administratively enforced. The first is based on a profound division of labor whereby every working operation is singled out as an autonomous activity organically linked with all the rest for the purpose of increasing the volume and reducing the cost of production. Marx demonstrated that, even in the manufacturing period, the production of, say, an ordinary pin involved a separation and combination of individual working operations which sharply boost labor productivity. And what about making a spacecraft? The degree of socialization here is so great that the interconnection between individual workers and the coordination and harmonization of actions can be compared to nothing short of a beehive or an anthill.

When this level of maturity is attained, Engels explained, the state finds itself simply forced to take on management functions because this scale of production transcends the bounds of not only private but even corporate ownership. In such a case, statization is a benefit, it ensures progress.

But a tendency toward a different type of socialization had emerged even that far back in the past. "...Ever since," Engels wrote in "Anti-Duering," "Bismarck rushed along the path of statization, there has been a special kind of bogus socialism... bluntly proclaiming that every statization, even Bismarck-style statization, is socialist. If a state tobacco monopoly is socialism, then Napoleon and Metternich must certainly be listed among the founders of socialism."

Such willful, directive, voluntarist, or whatever you like socialization is incapable of accelerating the development of production. On the contrary, it is a serious obstacle to it.

Many of our current troubles are actually rooted in the fact that Stalin vulgarized the Marxist teaching about the two types of socialization. [passage omitted]

A high price has to be paid for all this. And we must carry on paying until such time as we revert to Marx' interpretation of socialization.

But what does "revert" mean? Well, first and foremost we must define the economic framework within which **the state sector** is more efficient than any other. Within this framework, the state will be able to use the budget to solve a multiplicity of what are primarily noncommercial and social problems. Basic theoretical and major experimental research, military orders, expenditure on education, health care, and protection of public order—all this must be paid for by society via the state. Wherever it is more effective, we should rely on the entire spectrum of other forms of ownership—commercial activity must be performed mainly on the basis of cooperative, corporate, individual, and even private ownership. [passage omitted]

People might think that I am breaking down an open door, that the recently adopted Laws on the State Enterprise, on the Cooperative System, and on Individual Labor Activity and the ratification of the new Kolkhoz Model Statute have legislatively formalized the recognition of the objective reality of the multiplicity of sectors in the country's economy. In actual fact, however, a legal "swallow"—even when it is not alone—does not make a summer. The aforementioned acts have not shaken the monopoly of state ownership, and this enables negative processes to develop unhindered in the economy.

There is no need to look far for examples. State enterprises remain, as before, monopolists in the sphere of material and technical supplies, and all the rest are forced to get by according to the principle "Here you are, poor relation, make do with what we have no use for." The state sector is also outside competition in the distribution of capital investments. Labor resources are also distributed in its favor. Cooperatives and "individuals" are in fact allowed to engage only in work of minor importance. In today's conditions, they cannot organize any substantial production units. Because, I assume, there is a great fear that they might spotlight all the unseemly aspects of the "order" prevailing in the state sector. Even though cooperative members could be extremely successful in small-series production of minitractors and minicombine harvesters, for instance. And if waste utilization is organized—something that state enterprises simply are not and never will be able to do—everyone will be a winner.

State ownership vigilantly protects its privileges, not allowing even the slightest opportunity for other sectors to "show it up" in the course of healthy competition. This is done not only by deliberately placing "outside" enterprises in worse material conditions but also by pulling strings in the elaboration of sundry instructions regulating the activity of potential competitors. I think it is impossible to even contemplate a situation whereby conditions for competition between economic rivals are determined singlehandedly by the one who is to be competed against. And yet our state committees and ministries are free to weave a web of instructions and use them to enmesh those who are capable of disturbing the state monopolist's slumbers, which he will never choose to abandon of his own accord.

If we recognize the mixed nature of our economy, then the next resolute step is imperatively necessary. The time has come not only to legalize but to actually guarantee equal rights for all sectors of the economy in all spheres of activity. Let me emphasize: in all spheres, be it the allocation of material and technical resources, capital investments, and labor resources or taxation, whether direct or indirect. The present harmful monopolism and its direct offspring—stagnation in the economy—can be undermined only in conditions of proper competition for resources. But the path is solidly blocked by a Stalinist dogma rooted in our mind, which proclaims that state ownership is a priori the acme of perfection. It would be apt to say that some socialist countries have already taken the initial practical steps to equalize the rights of all sectors, and this is beginning to rally healthy forces within the economy. I think that this experience could be useful for us. Real equality of sectors is one of the main conditions for successful implementation of restructuring.

Everyone is now lashing out at voluntarism and bureaucratism. But the louder and more impassioned the criticism, the more luxuriantly and more lavishly these Siamese twins flourish. True enough, we are lashing out at them only verbally—there have been and there still are no real barriers against them. Why?

Once again, it all boils down to dogma. If—as we were taught and as things are now—the means of production are not a commodity, if a plant or a factory cannot be bought or sold, if land and water are not priced, if capital investments are distributed by banks not according to commercial considerations, not according to calculations of the guaranteed effect of their utilization and realistic interest charges for credit facilities, but according to the principle of "First come, first served," the wave of unruliness, anarchy, and voluntarism will naturally swell.

Growing numbers of scientists, economists, and economic managers are beginning to realize this. There are increasingly frequent calls to open up markets in means of production and capital.

Let us assume that these proposals are adopted. Let us assume that the dogma that, in our conditions, only onions, potatoes, and cabbage can be commodities and that this can happen only in the market place is jettisoned. But this alone will hardly remedy the situation.

Here is a situation to corroborate these doubts. Imagine a plant handily sited near a main highway and sources of cheap raw materials that has developed original technology for the manufacture of a promising product. All the objective technical and economic opportunities are present, so to speak. So there is every justification for allocating the appropriate credit facilities to this enterprise on a competitive basis. I am nonetheless convinced that the assimilation of the new production process there will produce yet another crop of bitter disappointments whose causes will have nothing to do with the engineering side. Either the city where our promising plant is sited will not let in the manpower it needs because of residence permit rules, or people will be unwilling to go there for perfectly understandable and down-to-earth reasons: It is not easy to uproot yourself from familiar places, and it is even more difficult to return once you leave. Because of residence permit rules.

No, this is not a matter of problems related to the passport system. That is just an external symptom of a defect on a much grander scale.

In our conditions, the work force too is not a commodity, like many other factors of production. This being so, people have no reason to wander from city to city or from enterprise to enterprise in search of their vocation. They have to rest satisfied with the fact the everyone has somehow found a niche in the place he was born. In our dynamic century, there is nothing good to be expected from such a medieval "pale" [osedlost], from a rate of circulation of blood through the arteries of the national economy that is reminiscent of the state of a hibernating frog. Practical workers can cite examples by the thousand of unique imported equipment operated in a scandalously bad manner simply because the country lacks a developed labor market. It is hard to recruit the specialist you need and without whom any equipment is nothing more than a heap of metal. Neither wholesale trade in means of production, nor cooperatives, nor lease contracts are capable of helping to remedy this ill.... You can't leave people to stew in their own juice for too long.

But once again there are widespread doubts in the way of sensible solutions. To recognize manpower as a commodity? This would mean legitimizing relations of exploitation, which is incompatible with the ideals of socialism. Of course, the labor market is not a market for captive slaves but a democratic institution in which a working person can determine the real worth of his work skills as assessed not by some functionary but by society, in the light of world criteria.

The dogmas we have inherited are strong because they are skillfully decorated with demagoguery. A recognition of manpower as a commodity, which objectively is what it is, is obstructed by the same objections which can be heard as regards the wholesale trade in means of production. Either a threat to socialism is seen everywhere, or total perplexity: Who will buy from whom if, in any case, "everything around belongs to the kolkhoz, everything around belongs to me." Even though it is clearer than daylight that resources—including labor resources—will be bought by the collective or enterprise which will be able to use them efficiently to the benefit of production, of people working there, and of society as a whole.

As we can see, sufficient time has elapsed to prove to us: The artificial gilt has well and truly worn off many of Stalin's dogmas. It is time not only to notice this but also to reject these dogmas themselves, replacing them with images from real life. Of course, not for the sake of drawing closer to some abstract truth, but guided by the need to remedy the hard economic situation in which we find ourselves.

Dogmas are certainly not commodities, but just think of the mind-boggling price we have to pay for them. It is certainly a fact that commodity stocks worth more than R450 billion are now lying frozen in warehouses in Gossnab enterprises. This is almost one-half our entire gross national product! Furthermore, there is a sum of R14 billion frozen in uninstalled equipment, and a further R9 billion in above-normative unfinished construction work. All this is the consequence of economic management based on obsolete ideas.

These losses—and there are countless of them in our national economy—do not enrich us, they actually ruin us all.

Scientific

'Mir' Crew Conducts Astrophysical, Medical Tests

LD3101125689 Moscow TASS in English 1211 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 31 TASS—By TASS correspondent from the Mission Control Centre:

The flight of the orbital research complex Mir, with Aleksandr Volkov, Sergey Krikalev and Valeriy Polyakov on board, is going on.

In accordance with the programme for the study of materials in space, the crew performed a series of experiments to test in practice a technology to apply metal coatings in space vacuum and zero gravity conditions by a method of electric beam evaporation and subsequent condensation. The experiments were carried out by means of Yantar apparatus, the working unit of which was installed in the orbital station's air-lock chamber. Two composite alloys of silver-and-palladium and tungsten-and-aluminium were sprayed upon a polymeric film.

The cosmonauts carry on astrophysical research with the use of the international orbital observatory Roentgen. Today its telescopes will be again directed towards an X-ray source believed to be a black hole in Circinus (pair of compasses) Constellation.

A medical control plan envisages an examination of Sergey Krikalev and Valeriy Polyakov for an evaluation of the condition of the cardiovascular system in space flight conditions. Aleksandr Volkov underwent the examination at the end of last week.

During the day the cosmonauts will also perform yet another cycle of experiments by means of the magnetic spectrometer Maria. The purpose of research being carried out now is to determine a possible interconnection between the intensive fluxes of high-energy charged particles in the area of the Brazilian magnetic anomaly and terrestrial seismic activity.

Baklanov Addresses Computer Technology Meeting

LD3091215489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] A conference was held today in the CPSU Central Committee on matters relating to computer technology. It was noted that during the 12th 5-Year Plan we have mastered the production of supercomputers, the mass production of personal computers has gotten under way, and the 4th generation of these is being developed. However, the technical standard and the volume of production of this technology do not yet fully meet the growing requirements of the national economy. This has become a topic for detailed discussion by leading scientists, general designers, specialists, directors, and party committee secretaries of major enterprises, as well as leaders of the economy and the party. The result was summed up by Comrade Baklanov, a CPSU Committee secretary.

Magnetic Levitation Train Project Considered

PM0102095389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 1

[V. Velikov report under the rubric "Fact and Comment": "By Magnetic Levitation to the Capital's Airports"]

[Text] The Ministry of Railways is studying the possibility of making use of the "Transrapid" high-speed system in our country.

Although high-speed magnetic levitation passenger trains are described as the "transport of the future," they already exist in Japan and the FRG and are being developed in the United States. Their advantages are speeds of hundreds of kilometers per hour and the absence of noise and pollution. The elegant carriages speed along specially-built elevated monorails and are propelled by the so-called running magnetic wave effect. There are no internal combustion engines or conventional electromotors.

The "Transrapid" system has been developed by a West German consortium headed by the well-known MBB [Messerschmitt Boelkow-Blohm] company. The system has proved its practical value over more than 15 years of development work and tests. On the 32-km experimental stretch between the cities of Lathen and Doerpen a speed in excess of 400 km/h was recently achieved.

H. Vogels, president of MBB, has visited Moscow and held business negotiations at the USSR Ministry of Railways on a joint project to build a "Transrapid" link. Specifically, a number of options for the transportation of air passengers between the capital and its airports was discussed. As is known, some 35 million air passengers pass through Moscow's airports every year, and each of them spends from 90 minutes to 2 hours on the surface journey between the capital and the airport.

"The high-speed system is not cheap: It costs more than R4.5 million per kilometer. But life is dictating the need for such a project," V. Butko, deputy minister of railways has said. (By way of comparison, it costs R25 million to build 1 km of subway!) "The relief of municipal surface transport on the busiest routes is long overdue."

A group of Soviet specialists in the field of the utilization of trains on magnetic "cushions" is embarking on a feasibility study and cost estimates in cooperation with experts from the FRG. When this work is completed, the question of a specific timetable for the construction of this project will be tackled.

In conclusion, here is a necessary clarification in connection with a recent report published in one of Moscow's newspapers about the construction in 1989 at the USSR Exhibition of National Economic Achievements of a "demonstration-and-commercial" Soviet-made magnetic levitation train line, and the construction at the same time of a link between Sheremetyevo-2 and the center of the capital: V. Sayushev, director of the country's main exhibition, and B. Yedidovich, chief of the air terminal complex of the capital's international airport, whom the IZVESTIYA correspondent has met, said no such work is under way and that it is unrealistic to expect materialization of the new transport facility this year.

Liquified Gas-Powered Plane Makes First Flight

LD2801193989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 28 Jan 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Summary] The TU-155 has made its maiden flight using liquified natural gas for fuel. L. Elin reports from the airport that the plane's designer, Tupolev sees the advantages of this alternative fuel as making transportation less expensive and reducing ecologically damaging emissions by three to four times. Existing gas pipelines can be used for gas deliveries. Inside the plane is a tank with a volume of 18 cubic meters, from which the liquid gas reaches the engines. The equipment works with the aid of high-pressure helium stored in canisters in the plane's cabin. A gas control system contributes to additional safety measures.

Two pilots and a flight engineer were the crew for the first-ever flight of a gas-powered plane. The flight lasted 3 hours.

Tupolev comments that the use of gas is very important, "especially for our country, since we have far greater reserves of natural gas than oil."

N.D. Kuznetsov, the academician who headed the responsible design office, adds that both long- and short-haul aircraft can use gas.

Military

Yazov Views Restructuring of Military Training

PM3001160589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jan 89 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "New Quality Military Education. Ways To Deepen Restructuring of Military Schools Defined at 24-25 January Conference of VUZ Leadership Staff in Moscow."]

[Text] What new developments demanding introduction in practice have emerged in the course of the restructuring of military education, what is stopping progress, and where should efforts be concentrated in order to deepen restructuring processes in VUZ's and fundamentally improve the training of officer cadres? Army General D.S. Sukhorukov, USSR deputy defense minister, devoted his report to an analysis of these questions.

The tasks of VUZ political organs and party organizations in further improving the restructuring of the teaching and education process in line with the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference decisions were the subject of a report delivered at the conference by Admiral of the Fleet A.I. Sorokin, first deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

Comrades V.N. Konchits, I.B. Urlin, A.S. Goryainov, A.F. Shcheglov, V.I. Petrov, N.F. Kizyun, V.Ya. Kremlev, G.V. Kalitko, and others took part in the discussion on the reports.

Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, spoke at the conference. The importance of the conference, he said, is determined by the fact that the Armed Forces, just like our entire country, are at a crucial stage of restructuring. The content and orientation of restructuring were defined for us by the 19th all-union party conference's principled directive on ensuring the efficiency of defense building primarily

along qualitative lines. As for the ways to restructure military education, they are rooted in the CPSU Central Committee February (1988) Plenum materials.

A decisive role in the restructuring of the Armed Forces, the defense minister stressed, must be played by the officer cadres. The basic criterion for judging the quality of their training is their readiness to impeccably perform their duties in the forces and fleets. It is obvious that this criterion also applies to the quality of work by military education establishments.

The majority of Soviet officers conscientiously perform their military duty. Examples of courage and skill are provided by their actions in Afghanistan, during the elimination of the consequences of the Chernobyl accident and the earthquake in Armenia, and in the performance of many other tasks in the most complex conditions. At the same time, there are numerous instances of military VUZ graduates being irresolute when making troop command decisions, being insufficiently confident in their mastery of weapons and equipment, lacking firm habits in the organization of practical work on the personnel's political, military, and moral education, and frequently being unable to work efficiently in conditions of democratization and glasnost. Instances of incompetence by VUZ graduates, and their inability to properly organize personnel training and education or the performance of tasks facing subunits, units, and ships confirm the need for decisive restructuring of military education.

Army Gen D.T. Yazov formulated the basic demands regarding the restructuring of military education. The main one is the training of cadres capable of providing more effective solutions, with due consideration for contemporary demands, to tasks concerning the maintenance of combat and mobilization readiness, the building of the Armed Forces, the training and education of troops, and the strengthening of military discipline. In the planning, organization, and methodology of training this means a decisive turn away from the bulk approach in the direction of individual approaches, of enhancement of the role of independent study, and of further integration between education and the achievements of military science and military art. It means consolidating the VUZ's scientific and pedagogical potential, radically improving their material and technical base, and ensuring the best possible combination of centralized leadership of education with broad democratism and enhanced sociopolitical and military activeness by undergraduate and postgraduate students.

The defense minister pointed out that improving the quality of officer cadres' training is a most important task at the contemporary stage of defense building. In order to solve it, it is necessary to concentrate efforts along a number of main avenues.

The first one involves restructuring the system of military education. This is a matter of both the organizational structure of VUZ's and the teaching and education process. The primary aim must be to enhance the quality of officers' military professional training and raising the standards of their general culture, especially of their psychological and pedagogical culture. The broadening of military cadres' engineering horizons and computer literacy are becoming increasingly important. New qualities must be imparted to the nurturing of lofty ideological, political, and moral attributes among undergraduate and postgraduate students. It is fundamentally important to ensure that the entire teaching and education process is closely geared to the tasks of officers' practical activity.

The system of regular certification of military education establishments is designed to deepen the restructuring of military education. Just like the unionwide system being introduced in the country in line with the CPSU Central Committee decision, it must provide for comprehensive assessment of the standards of teaching, educational, and scientific work, the qualitative composition of lecturers, and the state of the material base. On the basis of these assessments, VUZ's can either be given additional rights and privileges, or radical measures can be taken right up to their reorganization or closure.

The second avenue of the restructuring of military education involves measures to raise the standards of military cadres' tactical and specialized training. The training of officers for actions in combat conditions has been and still remains the VUZ's priority task. While subordinating the entire teaching and education process to the solution of this task, it is primarily necessary to bring theoretical and practical work fully in line with the nature of contemporary armed struggle and the defensive nature of Soviet military doctrine. This demand must be made profoundly clear to the leadership of VUZ's and to lecturers and undergraduate and postgraduate students.

In this context, the defense minister dwelt on several fundamental tenets. He emphasized the greater demands made in training in matters of combat readiness and the mastery of modern forms and methods to prepare for and conduct combat actions, one of whose most important features is their armywide and navywide nature. Modern weapons call for substantial changes in tactics and enhance the role of reconnaissance, skillful organization of firepower, and precise collaboration. Some VUZ's, however, at times hold on to formal applications of theory to practical work and fail to take the situation's specific conditions into account, instead of providing objective training in tactics and in the military art as a whole. This accustoms undergraduate and postgraduate students to stereotypes and schematism. Everything must be done to overcome this major evil in tactical training.

The basic demand concerning the methodology of this training is to ensure that studies and exercises provide conditions that bring students face to face with the need to seek and find the most expedient solutions and

methods of action to surprise the enemy, display military cunning, and engage in bold maneuvers on the battlefield. This is achieved primarily through the lessons to be learned from the initial situation, and through the unfolding of military actions governed by the decisions and practical actions of the trainees. In the same way that in combat the enemy would "punish" any failure to organize good reconnaissance, inadequate firepower, a stereotyped approach, irresolution, weakness of will, or inability to look ahead—the effect of all this must be made felt in exercises. And this is precisely the sphere in which many VUZ's fail to adequately instruct their undergraduate and postgraduate students.

The quality of studies and exercises must be judged not only by the trainees' actions, but also by the methodological lessons to be learned from them. In this context, the methodological skills of lecturers themselves are especially important. The enhancement of these skills should be promoted by improved content and methods in the command training of VUZ professorial and tutorial staff. Evidence of the urgent need for this can be seen in the stereotyped and formal tuition given by some lecturers.

Army Gen D.T. Yazov went on to dwell on questions of resolving the contradiction between the growing volume of knowledge and habits officers need and the limited time available for instruction. Life proves that the only way to resolve this contradiction is by intensifying the study process, primarily through utilizing the achievements of psychology, pedagogics, and computers and introducing advanced training methods. The main element in these methods is the individualization of training and the galvanization of trainees' activity. The only lasting knowledge is the knowledge a student acquires for himself. Military VUZ leaders and lecturers can find much that is useful in this regard in the materials of the all-union congress of public education workers. The concept of continuous education is fully applicable to military education. Whereas until quite recently officers were guided by the principle of "education to last a lifetime," nowadays they are hardly likely to perform their functions properly unless they restructure themselves according to a different principle—"a lifetime of education."

Unfortunately, most VUZ's have still not achieved a decisive turn away from the bulk approach in the direction of individual approaches and the shaping of each student's personality as a commander, political worker, or military specialist. They continue to apply a standard yardstick to all, geared to some "statistical average" undergraduate or postgraduate student. More often than not, individual approaches and individual methods exist only in words.

Traditional forms and methods of training also need to be improved in line with new pedagogical ideas. Specifically, it is necessary to firmly abandon the passive approach and introduce active forms and methods of training more widely. For example, lectures should be given only on new questions, and we should part company with unnecessary overorganization of the study process and the underrating of individual study by undergraduate and postgraduate students.

One of the most important tasks of VUZ's is to enhance the quality of undergraduate and postgraduate students' physical training. Smartness in drills must be persistently and firmly cultivated and neat appearance demanded.

The utmost improvement of officer cadres' training, the defense minister emphasized, is one of the key sources for enhancing the Armed Forces' qualitative condition while incurring virtually no additional material costs. Full use must be made of this source.

The third avenue for restructuring the work of VUZ's work concerns improving the general education of undergraduate and postgraduate students and training them in methods of leading their subordinates. It is well known that an officer's military-professional training comprises a package of knowledge and practical habits in the leadership of subunits, units, and ships. Unfortunately, this training is often detached from the practical tasks being resolved by troops.

Inadequate teaching standards among officers poses a serious problem for the Armed Forces. They are not always capable of correctly combining one-man command with the expansion of democratism, the right to issue orders through persuasion, and high standards of demandingness with spiritual closeness to their subordinates. Officers' collectives provide examples of scornful and inattentive attitudes not only toward subordinates, but also toward each other, and of demagoguery and disregard for rank. All this dictates the need to persistently and actively nurture among undergraduate and postgraduate students clear and precise ideas of the officer's honor, dignity, and nobility, which are an officer's compass in his service and his life. A special role in this regard must be played by the personal example set by command and political cadres and VUZ lecturers.

Today, under the conditions of glasnost and socialist pluralism, the ideological and moral maturity of military cadres is more important than ever before. Hence the content, forms, and methods of the teaching of social sciences must be not only more active, but also more convincing and capable of arming cadres with the truth of life. Every officer, and primarily VUZ lecturers, must be capable of using convincing arguments to prove the correctness of the party line in defense building, and to demonstrate the importance of and need for military service—the historical purpose of the Soviet Armed Forces.

Army Gen D.T. Yazov gave much attention to the strengthening of military discipline. It is necessary not only to ensure that it is maintained at the highest possible level within the VUZ system, but also to persistently train undergraduate and postgraduate students in

skillful work to instill strict regulation order. A number of VUZ's still experience incidents, crimes, and gross violations of discipline. The task of strengthening discipline and instilling order according to regulations in the forces cannot be resolved unless it is first resolved in schools and academies.

The fourth avenue of the restructuring of military education is the improvement of VUZ leadership. Many shortcomings in officers' training are attributable to the high degree of formalism in the leadership of VUZ's and the teaching and education process. Quite often the active and creative quest for more effective forms and methods is supplanted by sham efficiency and unnecessary paperwork for its own sake. Consequently, genuine progress is replaced by an illusion of movement, which is essentially nothing but marking time. The efficiency of VUZ leadership work can be judged only by end results, by the way the main tasks of officer cadres' training are performed. What are these tasks?

First, to educate military school and academy graduates as active bearers of party policy in the Army and Navy, to instill in them lofty ideological, ethical, moral, and combat qualities. Second, to cultivate graduates' high professional standards and their ability to intelligently organize and confidently command combat actions by subunits and units, as well as their entire life and activity. Third, to inculcate in graduates firm practical habits in the education of subordinates, the rallying of multinational soldiers' collectives, and organizational and political activity in conditions of democratization and glasnost.

It is in the military education establishment that an officer must acquire the firm foundation of these attributes. And a key role in laying this foundation must be played by lecturers. It is necessary to constantly improve the work of raising their qualifications and perfecting the organization of practical training in the forces.

The dynamism of our time and the natural process of generations succeeding one another necessitate a more active and more objective concern for the scientific development of professorial and tutorial staff and the training of highly skilled scientists. The quality of scientific and pedagogical activity must come first and foremost.

An important position in restructuring the leadership of military education belongs to the expansion of VUZ rights and enhancement of their autonomy, and to objective work to ensure preferential development of the teaching and material base and improvement of facilities. Ensuring normal living and working conditions is a question of major political importance.

In conclusion, the defense minister said that important, but still only initial steps have been taken in the restructuring of military education. They must be consolidated and further developed.

Taking part in the conference's work were Colonel General M.A. Moiseyev, USSR first deputy defense minister and chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff; deputy defense ministers; A.N. Soshnikov, deputy chief of a CPSU Central Committee department; and V.Ye. Shukshunov, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Public Education.